DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 721 HE 002 351

TITLE	Anarchy in the Academy. Second Report of The Temporary Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest.
INSTITUTION	New York State Legislature, Albany.
PUB DATE	1 Mar 71
NOTE	278p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, *Demonstrations (Civil), Higher Education, High Schools, *Planning, *Secondary Education, *Social Change, Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS	*New York State

ABSTRACT

In the course of studying the causes of student unrest in colleges and secondary schools, the Commission reviewed recent reports, visited institutions, held hearings throughout New York State, interviewed political, educational and lay leaders, undertook case studies and a school profile, and solicited and reviewed letters and other communications from members of the academic community, parents and the public. They also held symposia with both public and private secondary school students, surveyed administrators of 212 colleges and universities, 100 secondary school administrators, and 200 high school seniors from various parts of the state, and held conferences with the chancellor and trustees of the State University of New York, private college and university personnel, and members of the New York State Department of Education. This report, divided into sections on secondary and higher education, discusses and presents the data gathered and offers recommendations t the public, the schools, and the State Legislature. (JS)

ED052721

N·56
HE

NEW YORK STATE

Anarchy in The Academy

SECOND REPORT

OF

THE TEMPORARY COMMISSION

TO STUDY THE CAUSES OF CAMPUS UNREST

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ALBANY, N. Y.

MARCH 1, 1971

HE 003 351

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal		vii
Commission Members		ix
Staff Members		x
Acknowledgements		xi
Memorial to Senator Edward J. Speno		xiii
Chairman's Prologue		xv
The Teachers' Creed		xxxi
Introduction		1

PART I

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Section		
	Preface	7
I	Structure of Secondary Education in New York State	9
II	Secondary Schools 1970-71	
	-Students	19
	-Educational Atmosphere and Rules of Conduct	24
	-Faculty	28
	-Administration	35
	-Parents	37
	-Curriculum	38
	-Disruption and Attendance	40
	-Drugs	43
	-Private Schools	45
	-Physical Plant	47
	-Board of Regents and Commissioner of Education	48
	-Funding	50
	-Desire for Change	53
III	Recommendations (Secondary Schools)	55

Table of Contents

PART II

HIGHER EDUCATION

Section

	Preface	69
I	Structure of Higher Education in New York State	73
II	Higher Education 1970-71	
	-Role of the University	81
	-A Sense of Community	84
	-Trends on the Campus	87
	-Open Admissions and Minority Students	92
	-Student Activity Fees	97
	-Permanent Grievance Machinery	103
III	Recommendations (Higher Education)	105

PART III

COMMISSION MEMBERS' COMMENTS 117

Appendix to Part I

a.	Questionnaire, "Preliminary STATUS SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL UNREST For the Academic Years 1968-9 and 1969-70"	A 3
a-1.	Guide to Reading Tables	A13
b.	Analysis of High School Administrators' Responses to Survey and Tables	A15
c.	Analysis of High School Students' Responses to Survey and Tables	A39
d.	Assessment from Comparison of High School Surveys	A61
e.	New York City Board of Examiners	A66
f.	Excerpts from Agreement between Board of Education of the City of New York and the United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, AF of L, CIO	A67

Table of Contents

Appendix to Part I (Cont'd)

g. Profile of a New York City Junior High School A68

h. Case Study "High School A" A71

i. Case Study "High School B" A83

Appendix to Part II

j. Questionnaire, "STATUS SURVEY OF COLLEGE UNREST II For the Latter Part of the Spring 1970 Semester" A97

k. Extent and Nature of Unrest on University and College Campuses (Spring of 1970) (Survey) A103

l. Chapter 19 of the Laws of 1970 of the State of New York A133

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To The Governor and The Legislature:

On behalf of the Temporary State Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest, I hereby submit to you our Second Report, pursuant to Chapter 19 of the Laws of 1970.

Charles D. Henderson
Chairman

THE COMMISSION

Assemblyman Charles D. Henderson, Chairman
Senator John E. Flynn, Vice-Chairman
Assemblyman William F. Passannante, Secretary

MEMBERS

Appointed by the President
Pro Tem of the Senate:

Senators:
John E. Flynn
Albert B. Lewis
Edward J. Speno, Deceased

Appointed by the Speaker
of the Assembly:

Assemblymen:
Charles D. Henderson
William F. Passannante
Alvin M. Suchin

APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR

Edward F. Carpenter
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
Edward V. Regan, Esquire,
Resigned

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Earl W. Brydges, President Pro Tem of the Senate
Perry B. Duryea, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
John E. Kingston, Majority Leader of the Assembly
Joseph Zaretski, Minority Leader of the Senate
Stanley Steingut, Minority Leader of the Assembly
Warren M. Anderson, Chairman, Senate Finance Committee
Willis H. Stephens, Chairman, Assembly Ways and Means Committee

STAFF

Ernest G. Peltz. . . . . .Executive Director
Stanley J. Reiben. . . . . Counsel
Joan A. Norrish. . . . . .Administrative Assistant
Jan C. Smolik. . . . . .Director of Research
(Resigned October 7, 1970)
Audrey K. Boag . . . . . Research Associate (Psychology)
Katherine S. Blueglass . . . Research Associate (Sociology)
Ilze Melkis. . . . . Research Associate (Education)
(Resigned August 28, 1970)
Audrey S. Kasha. . . .Research Assistant (Political Science)
Ruth S. Martin Administrative Assistant

CONSULTANTS

James J. Brady . . . . . .Statistics
Peter Bush . . . . . .Student, Student Affairs
Muriel E. Galleher . . . . . .Governmental Relations
Arthur Grisham . . . . . .Student, Student Affairs
Kent M. Johnson. . . . . .Student, Student Affairs
William Lifton . . . . . .Administration
Michael E. Mirsky. . . . . .Psychology
Patricia Rosenbach . . . . . .Student, Student Affairs
Barbara Upton. . . . . Education
Lee R. Wolfe . . . . . .Statistics

SECRETARIAL ASSISTANTS

Betty S. Dixon
Jeannette F. Hoyle
Elaine F. O'Connell
Joan F. Oropallo
Marion Willetts

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To all who appeared at our public meetings, volunteered or consented to be interviewed and who supplied the Commission with relevant information, we express our appreciation and gratitude; their efforts will contribute greatly to the effectiveness of this report.

We wish to express our appreciation for the help extended the Commission in its assignment by those members of the Legislature who communicated with our Commission and provided us with the benefit of their thoughts, suggestions, counsel and opinions.

However, any errors of commission or omission which appear are the full responsibility of the Commission.

On the 17th day of February, 1971, State Senator Edward J. Speno, a member of this Commission, died at the age of 50 years.

Senator Speno's experience, judgment and wisdom were a source of great strength in the work of this Commission. More important, his courage and feeling for humanity were as much an inspiration to us as to the people of his community and our State of New York, which he so ably and devotedly served.

In noting its feeling of personal loss, the Commission and its staff wish to express our condolences to his wife, Audrey, and their four children.

CHAIRMAN'S

PROLOGUE

10

CHAIRMAN'S PROLOGUE

"What is happening to our school system?" That is the question in the minds of the public, parents, students, teachers, educators and public officials.

News media emphasize school closings, picketing teachers, angry parents, anarchy and violence in the classroom, embattled school boards, broken school windows, student dropouts and high school graduates unprepared for college or employment.

What has happened to the fundamental axiom that schools were for students and youth?

The Temporary State Commission on Causes of Campus Unrest, which submitted its first report in February 1970, has been seeking the answers to these questions and others relative to conditions in the secondary as well as higher educational institutions in New York State.

The study of the Commission has resulted in a revelation of facts and information that is both astounding and frightening, especially as concerns our most valuable possession, the youth of our state.

Members of this Commission, recognizing the sensitivity of its legislative mandate and responsibility, have been most diligent and dedicated in pursuit of the truth and facts. No member of the Commission has disputed the truth of the information we have assembled although there has been some disagreement in the analysis of the information relative to importance and

priorities. Many hours of discussion of our findings preceded this report.

As Chairman of the Commission, I have invited all members to submit their own interpretation, opinion and analysis to be made a part of the report and identified as such.

When I became a member of the Legislature, I made a commitment to the people I represented as well as to myself to be forthright and to take a position or stand on propositions even though not always publicly popular. I am compelled to do so now in the aspiration that rational solutions to the critical and sensitive problems being encountered with your youth in this state and nation will be generated.

We cannot expect miracles or a single solution to resolve the contention, but we can and should expect understanding, compassion, willingness and cooperation in the resolution of a most complex and perplexing situation.

There are no simple answers or blanket solutions to a condition that has evolved in years of transition and changing times. We face a world of tensions well known to all through our instantaneous world-wide communications. We no longer live in a provincial isolated neighborhood. The societal ills and involvements of all nations and peoples are known throughout the world and are somewhat of world-wide concern. Such concern is present in the youth of the world as it never has been before.

Chairman's Prologue

The ambition for obtaining an education and qualifications for a job are no longer the prime objective of youth. They are, in the majority, troubled with the future prospects of living - the ecology and environmental calamity, war, poverty, racism, justice and equal opportunity.

Youth have always been, as stated in our previous report, impressionable, impatient and demanding of instant solutions to the apparent inequities and imperfections of society. Young people today are more knowledgeable and aware although perhaps not more mature at an earlier age than past generations.

They are living in an age of jet speed beyond the capacity with which many humans are able to contend. The effects of this age are reflected in home life, the schools and everyday living.

While man, among many other achievements, has been able to walk on the moon, we have as a nation been engaged in the longest war in American history and have not been able to overcome decay of our environment, racism, poverty, injustice and hidden bigotry.

Unfortunately our homes, schools and government have not been able to keep pace with the technological genius of man with resultant frustrations within most people irrespective of their stations or periods of life.

What the world needs is a rest long enough for our souls to catch up with it. Progress and competition deny this.

Chairman's Prologue

The people of this nation have been going down the wrong road for too long. In our struggle for an utopian life, our governmental leaders have lead us into a life of false security. We must recoup and consolidate our gains, stop fighting each other and concentrate on a solution for the mutual benefit of all as a nation and world.

Genuine concern and compassion for our fellow man are key ingredients in such an endeavor.

Let's start first with the home and parental level. Most parents in their understandable desire for a better life for their children insist, pressure and emphasize that education is a must or their young are doomed to failure in life. Surely no one will argue that an education is desireable, but what is an education for one can be a nightmare for another.

An education should not be forced on anyone who does not have both the capacity and desire. Desire may be inspired but not a capacity, as all persons are not born with equal academic ability, but we can and must provide equal opportunity to achieve fulfillment of individual capabilities.

Insistence by a parent for a child to do more than he is capable may be harmful, destructive and frustrating. However, parental encouragement and understanding to induce a child to develop to the greatest potential can result in a happy, fruitful life.

Chairman's Prologue

Home is the first school and first church for youth. It is where they learn what is good, what is right, what is kind, what is bad, evil, and cruel. Careful or neglectful training in the home to a great degree determines the child's state. If there is parental estrangement, abandonment and lack of love in the home, there is the beginning of unrest in the child.

Next during the formative years of the child comes the influence of the school. Irrespective of inculcation in the home, the school will play a potent part in determination of the child's destiny. If the school atmosphere is cold, stolid, rigid and inflexible and evinces an aura wanting in people who care, love and are concerned for the child, further unrest develops.

Children learn what they live whether it be in the home or in the school.

Conditions in the world in which they live is the next factor of influence on their lives, but the home life and the schools take precedence in shaping their lives.

Study of unrest in the education system, the views of every representative such as teachers, supervisors, administrators, parents and taxpayers, were expressed often through the aid of counsel, public relations people and officers of organizations. These views were presented in a well-organized and professional manner.

However, there was one group that was not represented by organization, counsel, public relations experts or officials to speak for them. They are the millions of children for whom the educational system ostensibly was created.

Therefore, in this report I decided to speak for them as I understand their views and attitudes as expressed by those with whom our Commission communicated. I speak for them not in a negative sense and not in a sense of criticizing others, but in a constructive sense in expressing the underlying causes of unrest.

It would be naive to say there are no disruptive, disobedient, ornery or difficult children. There are. But how did they become that way? Are the institutions that are responsible for many years of their lives meeting the problem or compounding it?

The Commission's study covered two levels of education, higher and secondary. However, conditions in the secondary schools were closely related to the preceding elementary level and there was also a correlation of unrest between secondary and higher education.

Very early in the study it was evident there was a greater potential of unrest in the secondary schools, where education is compulsory, than in higher education. The unrest was greatest in the inner city schools, next in the suburban schools and least in the rural schools.

The reasons for unrest, although basic in all schools, were of a different nature in the city and suburban schools.

Chairman's Prologue

Recognizing the prevalence of unrest in the city schools, our study was directed for the most part to this segment.

Basic causes of unrest centered around home life, school operation and societal ills of the outside world.

War, often expressed as a cause of unrest, appears to be more a medium through which unrest was expressed although the causes were for other reasons. If the war ended immediately, there would continue to be turmoil in our education system until some of the other potential causes are removed.

Some of the causes of discontent, most of which were manifest in both secondary and higher education, and not necessarily in order of importance are:

1. World environment;
2. Rigidity and inflexibility of the school system;
3. Schools as a battleground for teachers, administrators and parents;
4. Teacher strikes, parent protests;
5. Poverty;
6. Racism and bigotry;
7. Inequality of justice;
8. Curriculum irrelevance to educational needs of today;
9. Demagoguery of public officials and business leaders;
10. School size.

These causes are not all-inclusive, but the major reasons for acrimony in schools. Many people will point to drug use as

cause of discord, but in my opinion, use of drugs are more a symptom and result of uneasiness and frustration.

There are certain phases of our study and some personal observations which I feel are so critical to the situation that I am compelled to point them up.

Schools have become the battleground of teacher unions to secure better working conditions, benefits and security; of parent organizations seeking greater accountability of the school system for better results in the education of their children.

Administrators have used the schools in their pressure for more money from the State and their promotion of increased tax burdens for all to gain their demands with little responsibility for accountability or justification.

Strikes by teachers and closing of schools by parents have been most disruptive and a harmful influence on the minds of students who must conclude that force, legal or otherwise, is the accepted method to gain demands.

We are now reaping the harvest of years of inadequate teaching and inadequate preparation when we have young people completing the required number of years of schooling who cannot read, write, add or subtract and are not prepared for the outside world, neither in employment nor the capacity of pursuing higher education whether it be in a regular institution of higher learning or even a trade school.

Chairman's Prologue

Our educational system is a paradox. There are the true professionals dedicated to their goal of molding the minds of the young and preparing them for adulthood, but frustrated by the rigidity and inflexibility of an antiquated system and mandates of the hierarchy.

There are the disinterested who perceive their positions as a mere job for the purpose of making a living without regard to the delicate and important role they are playing in the future of the country through the destiny of our young.

Educators and teacher groups continuously claim New York State schools lead the nation. They refer to studies by educators, National Merit Scholarships and Westinghouse Science Talent Search, but fail to mention that the vast majority of the winners come from private schools or the select schools in the public sector.

There is evidence that the school system has not escaped the trend to bureaucracy and red tape which leads to impersonalization. The sheer number of the young in our school system requires leadership, authority and responsibility. It is recognized that in a system of such size, some central authority is necessary to formulate and guide a program of education for all segments of our student population.

However, the very remoteness of the central authority points up the necessity of correlative leadership and authority at the immediate level, the level closest to the student and particular unit of the school system.

Chairman's Prologue

Schools are a melting pot of ethnic and racial ingredients. Demands of elder separationists are evidenced by racial power groups, but not so much by the students or youth.

The child knows that he is different. What is most important is that he understands the differences and accepts them; not, however, as denoting superiority of one ethnic group over another.

Racism and bigotry that is instilled in the student by parents or elders contribute to the child's bitterness and resentment of fellow students or authority not of the same ethnic group.

Poverty, large disadvantaged segments of our society in a nation of apparent wealth, while not a responsibility of the school, nevertheless have a significant effect on the school function. The student who is hungry, unhealthy and poorly clothed has a much dimmer hope or motivation for an education, or any achievement.

The apparent inequality of justice confronts the youth daily and must be cited as a cause of unrest. Reports point to the more affluent or influential groups who escape jail sentence or prosecution, while those accused of lesser crimes are held for long periods awaiting trial or are convicted and sent to jail. Resentments naturally build up to rebellion.

A less explosive but nonetheless serious complaint is the irrelevance of school curriculum to meet today's needs. Some required courses not necessary to the student's pursuit in life were considered a waste of time and effort and further examples

of ridigity and inflexibility.

In another area, centralization and larger schools have been the ambition and plea of educators to provide an enriched program of education. However, our study revealed that the larger and more impersonal the school, the greater the trouble and turmoil.

The most explosive of our educational problems have been brewing in our "inner city" schools for years. This is where the poor are concentrated as a result of migration to the cities.

Dramatic change in the population in the last few decades reveals the core of the problem. During the same period there has been an exodus of white and recently, black middle-class, from the cities. The result is a sharp rise in non-white enrollment in the city schools.

For example, 52% of the students in New York City schools are non-white. In Manhattan it is reported 84% are non-white, about evenly divided between Negro and Spanish Surname American.

Schools serving these groups in the City are largely the oldest and generally poorest equipped. Reports are that licensed teachers shy away from these areas and many substitutes are employed. Students thus, have many new and different teachers who are unfamiliar with the student's neighborhood, background or personal problems. There are a few exceptions in schools in the Ghetto area where principals and faculty relate to the problems of the students and show an affection

and deep concern for the students. In these schools the achievement is much higher and the atmosphere more friendly.

Generally, tests of students in the Ghetto area reveal they are lower in the essentials such as reading and verbal ability. Not only does this contribute to resentment and unrest of the student, but it generates anger against the schools by parents and adults as well.

Many education and government officials, believing that segregated education is unequal education, have turned to various methods of desegregation as a remedy. Redistricting, open enrollment and busing have been used.

Such methods have done little more than temporarily raise the hopes of those in the disadvantaged areas. People there recognize this and are demanding quality education in their neighborhoods.

What is needed and now, in my opinion, is concentration on improvement of the inner city schools, especially with teachers who understand and can identify with the perplexity and frustrations of the hungry and unhealthy child from a broken or unhappy home, the child who has lost hope and motivation.

Appropriate equipment to meet the needs of students in these areas is an absolute must and now if we are to move toward resolving the problems of unrest and turmoil. While modern schools cannot be built immediately, it has been proven that with the necessary ingredients for teaching, other facilities can and must be employed to meet the present crucial needs.

Chairman's Prologue

Better tools and teachers alone will not alleviate the problems unless there is cooperation, understanding and a closer relationship between the residents of the community and the schools.

Accountability on the part of the school system is an absolute essential and a right of the community. Without accountability, more battles for control are certain with the student the victim of the crossfire.

If we are to restore schools to their normal function of providing our youth with a peaceful atmosphere in which to obtain an education, it will require all segments of the system to assume their rightful responsibility and to stop putting the blame on the other.

Public officials and legislators must take their share of the blame for the condition of the schools. Unquestioned support of the pleas for more money to salve the desires of a constituency without requiring accountability has not proven to be responsible or prudent either in the expenditure of the money or the quality of education.

Survival of our school system depends on no strikes against the schools by parents or teachers, strict accountability on the part of administration and supervisors, an acceptance without reservation that the schools are for students, a closer relationship and better communication by parents, teachers, administration, students, government and the public with an understanding amongst all of the difficulties each entity may encounter in the pursuit of their particular responsibility.

Chairman's Prologue

The complexity and magnitude of the problems that have festered over a long period of time cannot be taken lightly, reported and deserted.

There is no single solution, there is no panacea to erase the situation from sight or mind. These are our children's lives we are dealing with and ultimately the future of this country.

No nation can survive modern times which does not recognize that its greatest resource is still its youth. When America is suddenly cut off from some element that is essential to our welfare, almost immediately a substitute is found.

There is no substitute for the loss of the youth or the next generation.

This report, which in many ways has been an anguishing task, we hope will generate the interest, the concern and the absolute necessity of action to take the first steps in alleviating a malignant situation.

The successful schools we visited, the competent and dedicated teachers and administrators we talked with, the well-adjusted students who displayed knowledge and concern for their less fortunate brothers, all give rise to the realization that we can overcome the problems confronting us.

Pray God that it will be achieved.

Charles D. Henderson
Chairman

THE TEACHERS CREED

I believe in boys and girls, the men and women of a great tomorrow.

I believe in the efficacy of schools, in the dignity of teaching, and in the joy of serving others.

I believe in a wisdom as revealed in human lives as well as in the pages of a printed book, in lessons taught not so much by precept as by example, in ability to work with the hands as well as to think with the head, in everything that makes life large and lovely.

I believe in beauty in the schoolroom, in the home, in daily life, and in the out-of-doors.

I believe in laughter, in love, in fact, in all ideals and distant hopes that lure us on.

I believe in the present and its opportunities, in the future and its promises, and in the divine joy of living.

Edwin Osgood Grover

3/16/71

INTRODUCTION

The Governor and the 1970 New York State Legislature to whom this Commission made its first report, directed that the study be extended. The Commission was directed to continue its work in the colleges and universities with an additional mandate for similar studies in the secondary schools.

The Commission met and re-elected as its officers, Chairman Charles D. Henderson, Assemblyman from Steuben County; Vice Chairman John E. Flynn, Senator from Westchester County and Secretary William F. Passannante, Assemblyman from New York City.

It resolved as before, to "LISTEN AND LEARN" from all, both on and off the campuses; from those who had an interest in, information or knowledge of unrest at both the college and secondary level.

In carrying out its mandate, the members of the Commission determined that the investigation should be carried out in a manner which would not serve any political motive. It was determined that the fact finding process would be almost quasi-judicial in nature. It would be devoid of sensationalism and publicity. Individuals who desired to speak with us were guaranteed the right of totality of expression of views in an atmosphere of understanding and one removed from political consideration. It was to carry out its assignment in a manner which fit the subject, i.e. in a climate in which free dialogue could flourish.

The Commission continued its policy that the various schools and the members of the academic community should, whenever possible, be given the opportunity to resolve their own problems with the Commission acting as catalysts in the process.

Sources of Information and Field Work:

The Commission reviewed in depth the most current reports and finding in academia and further developed an open method for the continuing study of colleges as well as the newly mandated study in the secondary schools.

During the year:

Visits were made to colleges and secondary schools in all parts of the State in an atmosphere in which open and honest conversations and observation developed.

Hearings throughout the State were attended by school administrators, faculties, students, alumni, parents, taxpayer groups and members of the public at large.

Many political, educational organization leaders and lay leaders, with knowledge in the field, were interviewed. Unlike many who appeared at the hearings, they held no positions at schools.

Case studies and a school profile were undertaken. The Commission solicited and received many letters and other communications, both specific and general, from members of the academic community (college and secondary), parents and the general public.

The Commission met in numbers of symposiums with both public and private secondary school students.

A survey was made of administrators of 212 colleges and universities in the State relating to the qualitative and quantitative nature of unrest.

A random sample survey of 100 secondary school administrators of the State, to develop data relating to the range of unrest in secondary schools was conducted.

A random sample survey of 200 secondary school seniors from various parts of the State was undertaken to develop similar data about the range of unrest.

The Commission and its staff either visited, conducted interviews or otherwise were in contact with members of school communities representing in excess of 110,000 college and graduate students and approximately 120,000 secondary students.

Conferences were held with the Chancellor and Trustees of the State University of New York, as well as interviews and conferences with private college and university personnel and with members of the Department of Education of the State of New York.

PART I

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

PREFACE

PART I, SECONDARY SCHOOLS

In the Spring of 1970 it was not the Commission's intent to devote the majority of its secondary school study to the examination of conditions in the large urban centers. The early public meetings, interviews, and the day-to-day occurrences, and later, the results of our surveys caused this emphasis.

Much of the report deals with material obtained in the largest single municipal school system in our State, which because of its very size is beset by all the ills which have affected school systems everywhere. The statewide surveys and case histories reveal many of the same symptoms elsewhere in the State, as found in the New York City system.

While the major problems in secondary unrest are in the larger metropolitan centers, the relationships and similarities of our findings in the cities in the area of unrest equally applies to the hundreds of other schools in the State of New York.

It is not suggested, nor can it be concluded, that the staffs of our secondary schools are all incompetent and insensitive. The school, as is the rest of our world, is in turmoil due to the rapidly changing society.

That, too often children are not learning, from teachers who too often do not teach or care, in schools where administrators too often do not administer, is a tragedy of our times.

PART I

SECTION I

STRUCTURE of SECONDARY EDUCATION

in NEW YORK STATE

Structure of Secondary Education

A look at secondary education in the State of New York in terms of the gross numbers of students, the types of students and the number of teachers, as well as where the schools are, is an introduction to the very complexity of the study of unrest in these schools. New York State has the second largest elementary and secondary school enrollment in the Nation, second only to California. The students for whom the system exists come from small rural communities, wealthy suburbia and the impoverished and run down inner city ghetto areas. Between these are students from every socio-economic division of our society.

Enrollment in Secondary Schools by Type of School

Type of School 7 - 12	Pupils
Private	336,551
Public	1,512,787
Total	1,849,338

Of the private schools grades 7 - 12, 6.4% are nondenominational and 93.6% are parochial. The parochial enrollment is broken down as follows:

Religious Affiliation	Pupils
Catholic Schools	290,010
Jewish Schools	20,806
All Others	25,735

Ethnic distribution in public secondary schools:

Ethnic Type	Pupils
American Indians	11,434
SSA (Spanish Surnamed Americans)	106,626
Negroes	201,773
Whites & Others	1,186,040

A study of the ethnic distribution in grades K - 12 shows a great concentration of ethnic minorities in the "Big 6":

Location	Percent Negro	Percent SSA
Albany	32.7	.3
Buffalo	37.7	.8
Rochester	31.1	3.7
Syracuse	22.5	.3
Yonkers	13.1	4.4

In New York City over half of the student enrollment comes from minority groups, 33.7% Negro, 24.2% SSA, and American Indian and Oriental comprise 1.6%.

The rest of the State is categorized as follows:

	Percent
White	95.3
Negro	4.
SSA	.7

The following tables cite information which was compiled from 91 returned surveys on high school unrest:

Enrollment Figures

Enrollment Ranges	Number of Schools
500 or less	26

Enrollment Ranges (Cont'd)	Number of Schools (Cont'd)
500 - 2000	54
2001 - 5000	10
5000 +	1

Type of High School	Percentage of Surveyed Schools
Public high schools	69
Private parochial and private high schools	31

Local Distribution

Location	Percentage of Surveyed Schools
Rural	34
Urban (Over 100,000)	28
Urban (Less than 100,000)	17
Suburban	21

Ethnic distribution of surveyed high schools:

Percentage of Student Body Being White

Percent	Number of Schools
96 - 100	49
75 - 95	30
60 - 75	9
5 or less	3

One school surveyed is predominantly black (90% to 100%). In two schools, from 50% to 70% of the students are Puerto Rican. Forty-seven schools have from 1.9% to 10% Negro students.

Structure of Secondary Education

Surveyed Secondary Schools

	Percent of Total
Co-educational	78%
Male	11%
Female	11%

Percentage of students planning non-collegiate advanced training:

Percent of Pupil Ranges	Number of Schools
1 - 10	40
11 - 20	22
21 - 40	13

72% of the schools have 41% or more of their students planning to attend college.

Faculty-Student Ratios

Number of Students Per Teacher	Number of Schools
1 - 5	2
6 - 10	none
11 - 15	21
16 - 20	63
20 - 25	none
26 - 30	5

PART I

SECTION II

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

1970 - 1971

SECONDARY SCHOOL UNREST

A study of high school unrest cannot be limited to an examination of the buildings or the administrations or what takes place inside the school room. We all learn and did learn as much outside the school room as in it. Today, to an even greater extent the young are constantly exposed to more sophisticated lessons on television and in their daily contacts outside the school than were their parents and grandparents. This is not to say that the educational needs of this generation are being satisfied by this combination of school and unstructured outside learning.

That these outside stimuli are reflected in the students' school experience was documented in many contacts with students, faculty, administrators and parents. Equally, the day to day exposures in the school setting color the pupil's attitudes elsewhere. There is an input, feedback, input pattern from the home and its environment to the school and its environment and back again, in a continuous interplay. The home environment's attitudes concerning education or another racial ethnic group can be either reinforced or dispelled by the school experience and vice-versa.

Observation shows that the parent who faults the school entirely is as wrong in his belief as the school administrator who claims that all his problems come from the greater society and home. Both are in error and at the same time correct. These attitudes, which are not uncommon, are particularly salient when two aspects of public secondary education are noted. With few

exceptions the young people are required by law to attend, making them at least for a part of the day the charges of the school, and the young people are traveling the difficult road from childhood to maturity. The responsibility of both the parent and the school is manifest during this developmental period.

As do their older brothers and sisters at colleges, the secondary school students wish to be recognized in the decisions that affect their lives at school. The extent of recognition may differ, but the desire to be heard is the same.

STUDENTS

The reason for the existence of an educational system is to teach students. However, the schools have become battlegrounds between administrators and boards of education and faculties for more money and better working conditions, for ideological struggles and societal conflicts. Schools have become the focal point and battleground for community pressure groups. They are becoming many things other than proper teaching institutions.

Students feel that their principals will side with a teacher, no matter what the facts. Many see both supervisor and teacher as utilizing the school system for their own benefit rather than for that of the students; most find that teachers have no time for them outside of the class itself.

In many of their classes, they reported that they felt order came before learning. If they argued or disagreed with the teacher about the subject, they were considered disruptive.

These attitudes reinforce the feelings of students' separation from the teacher and administrator. The frustrations engendered can lead to belligerence and violence. It appears that the gulf is wide - and getting wider. There is cause to fear that there will be more disruption and violence.

There exists tensions in high schools and junior high schools, especially in the cities, which many prefer to hide or overlook. Black / white tensions are in the school the same as they are outside of it. To those who are concerned that these tensions will result in violence, it can be said that the violence is already here, that the battleground is the urban school, the troops are teenagers,

and the causes well known.

It would be unfair and wrong to blame school administrators and teachers for the culmination of hundreds of years of oppression and neglect. However, in many areas of the system a resistance to the truth and a resistance to meaningful change shackle the amelioration of these tensions.

These children were not born hating, they learned from their elders. Neither the greater society nor the school is making sufficient effort to prevent and cure such characteristics.

Examinations and Marking

Students object to the traditional grading system and the New York State Regents Examinations as being pressure producing. They say these cause them to learn particularly specific items in a course. They have learned that the teacher wants this material parroted back on the exams and in papers. Because they have to learn specific items in the course, the students say they are unable to choose those things that interest them, and that are consequently personally relevant. They cite personality preference, or lack of preference, as a reason for some grading.

In an innovative and progressive experimental school, the Commission found a marking system with which the students appeared to be happy and comfortable. Instead of the usual A, B, C, D and F, the students were marked in grades which showed their mastery of the subject. M was given for mastering the subject matter of the course, MC for mastery with condition (passing, but at a lower level) and R for retention (repeating the work). While there is no mark which designates failure, R (repeating the work) appears to be the same thing. The faculty saw no

difficulty because of the marking system for those students wishing to continue their educations.

Guidance and Motivation

Both students and parents were concerned with the competence of those giving guidance to students (helping students to choose a life's work and routing them toward that goal). Some young people and their parents object to the very early decisions in determining programs which the parent and student little understand and which may not prepare the student for the future. Parents say that less time should be spent in guidance and more time in teaching the students to read. One education supervisor remarked,

> "Many of the students who have been turned off, or frustrated, are not necessarily college-bound....guidance counsellors are not well equipped to provide guidance to the non-college student, and particularly to the black student."

Students of superior academic ability are sometimes shunted into programs that stifle what motivation toward learning they had. Many are in classes for which they are not ready. As one student told the Commission,

> "I was told I should get a general diploma", (lower graduating level).

However, he was a good athlete and he told his coach he was going to quit school. His coach told him to go to a different school. He is now doing superior work in that school. Before coming to his present school, he felt he was not understood, he was frustrated and held down.

In a few noticeable cases, drifting or disruptive students are motivated and become responsive. Former dropouts succeed in schools like Harlem Prep, which principally concentrates on

those young people considered to be failures by the public school system. These students give evidence that it is not the youngster who always fails, but that the system fails him.

In these cases, there is great emphasis on teacher-student relationships and guidance, as well as academic progress. Whether these innovations can be widely employed remains a question, but their short history is impressive.

The street academies, many are nothing more than converted store fronts, operate with educational workers on the street and teachers inside. The workers encourage the dropout to return to his education and offer guidance and counsel. Once motivated to return, he is taught by teachers who know him as a person as they teach him. The street worker continues his interest and contact with the student throughout his schooling.

Harlem Prep has some 385 students. While in existence only three years, it has graduated 214. Of these graduates, only ten have left college, two of whom were inducted into the armed forces.

Student Power

Young people who are drifting, who are not motivated, who feel not understood and frustrated can easily condemn a society in which they feel powerless.

The weak are always tempted toward violence, since they lack other means to pit their spiritual strength, loyalties, convictions, and indignations against the material resources of the strong.

In discussions of the students' drive to obtain power, the Commission heard of instances where individuals or groups outside the school actively encouraged them to "test" the school system by creating disruption. Additionally, some in the New York City area felt that one group's (Civil Liberties Union) attempts to

explain Constitutional rights to students had perhaps inadvertently encouraged disruptive unrest. However, you cannot dispel all unrest by blaming outside agitators. There are outside contributors, but these are involved in the daily life of the student in the school and outside as well.

Some said that within the school there are militant faculty who agitate the students to "test" the system.

When disruptive unrest occurs in the school, it receives greater publicity than similar actions would receive if they happened outside the school walls. This attention by the news media sometimes promotes further disruption and greater unrest.

EDUCATIONAL ATMOSPHERE AND RULES OF CONDUCT

Visitation by staff and Commission members, especially to schools in metropolitan areas, revealed in many instances, an educational atmosphere of discontent, fear, frustration, futility and over-regimentation, and an accompanying desire to "get out". There was little evidence of the mutual trust and faith and guidance so essential to the learning process.

No matter how much is contributed financially to the educational system, it shall be wasted so long as such an atmosphere persists.

These attitudes and atmosphere are a major cause of unrest and if allowed to continue will eventually further destroy the entire system.

One administrator cautioned that changing times should not be confused with permissiveness. Students favorably respond in situations that relate to their need to be individuals, where they are involved in the decisions which affect their school lives. A cited issue among them is that they cannot understand the dress and conduct codes. In those schools where students, faculty and administrators have gathered and jointly developed rules for appearance and conduct, the rules have tended to be toward moderate modern style and are peer group enforced for the most part.

Students object to "up and down" staircases (restricting up passage to certain staircases and down passage to others), divided traffic halls, bells, washroom passes, poor food and service, etc. These causes of unrest do not lend to solution as readily as do

the hair and dress styles. One educator remarked that the secondary school reminded him of a prison. He noted that,

> "convicts do not need a pass to go to the bathroom".

While this may be an extension to make his point, there is a depressing repressive atmosphere in many of our secondary schools. Some smaller schools have done away with the bells for passing of classes, "up and down" staircases, etc. In some large, but experimental schools, the students are free to move about when not in assigned classes. In these innovative schools, disruption is at a minimum.

However, there must be rules in the school as in any community. Violation of the rules and gulations of necessity calls for disciplines; the more rules and regulations, the more disciplines.

Total regimentation, however, is contrary to the growth of the mind and completely destroys the objective for which the school was established.

Good education requires a more important and critical discipline from within - the discipline of concentration, the thought processes of experimentation - not only the asking of questions, but of developing the mind so that it arrives at logical conclusions.

Personal characteristics of each student must be considered and understood. Education cannot be imposed or injected, but rather, guided and led; inflexibility makes no allowance for such drawing out, and in fact, destroys any attempt to develop it.

Rigidity in the education system is born of ingrained habit and bureaucratic inertia. In the urban centers, competing interests among educators, faculty and parents contribute to the administrator's

passive attitude and fear of offending entrenched interests, resulting in doing nothing and offending no one. The student, caught in the crossfire, is the victim.

Administrators, pointing to overcrowding, consider it unrealistic to remove long held restrictions on the students. They speak of sound level and evacuation of buildings in case of fire. Importantly, the students generally were not aware of the administration's reasons. Specifically, there is a failure of communication among administrators and faculty and students. This failure, as well as poor communication between these groups and parents and the community, is almost everywhere a cause of unrest.

Students have related that they did not trust the administration or the faculty. They did not feel they could safely go to them with their personal problems and some said they were reluctant to see faculty or administrators about academic problems.

While improved, responsive communication could dispel this student attitude, which might be based on misunderstanding, it is not felt to be a panacea. There is a general need for change. Boards, administrators, principals and teachers should recognize students not only as consumers of education but as contributors in the designing of their educations.

Frequently the Commission has been told that students must change if they are to perform this new role. They must accept the system as legitimate and reject disruption as they participate in the change.

Community or School Spirit

The spirit of community is more the exception than the rule. The Commission heard of the need to develop a greater feeling

of belonging to the school community. It often was suggested the interscholastic competition, especially athletics, can be the principal agent in giving students, faculty and administrators a common cause, developing "school spirit" and promoting further cooperation in other areas. There appears to be greater peer group activity in preventing grievances from growing into disruptions at schools where interscholastic competition is promoted and consequently well attended.

There is every indication that one of the underlying reasons for unrest in the secondary schools is the loss of school identification, "school spirit". Where there are no programs of school activities, the young people in this age group, in looking for something to do, often drift into anti-social behavior.

FACULTY

Students talk of those teachers they feel are not equipped for their jobs. In such a teacher's class, they experience boredom, annoyance and frustration in meeting the requirements.

Some educators and most students regard the schools as overly regulated and highly resistive to change. In "Crisis in the Schoolroom", the result of an extensive study commissioned by the Carnegie Corporation, Charles E. Silberman exhaustively documented that a hallmark of the present system is its rigidity. Experience in New York State supports this conclusion. This apparent inflexibility must be considered a major contributing factor to the disruptive atmosphere.

A young teacher who had just finished a secondary teacher's program crystalized an often expressed sentiment about the effects of this rigidity in teacher-training in saying,

> "The only courses that I had that were worthwhile were the classes I had when I was in high school (as a student teacher) ... (However) I found myself faced with three supervisors. These people were going to kill me (as a teacher) or they were going to say, 'You're going to be a teacher'. My life was in their hands. They told me that this is how we have taught for so long and this is what we find is the best and you adopt their system and you will be a good teacher.
>
> What I really feel is that instead of all these background courses of foundations of education, problems of (etc.) ..., the preparation system should be changed to give you time to go out and spend some time in the high schools and learn about the feelings of different classes of students, of black students, high achievement students, of middle income students ... By that time (student teaching), you're a senior and there's no way you can drop out of the 'Ed' program without having to take another year and exposing yourself to the

> draft (if male). This puts a lot of poor teachers into the system because by the time they find out they don't like it, they have no where to go."

Students in the secondary school system, arrive there and stay there at an extremely vulnerable stage in their lives. The physical and psychological changes taking place in a youngster of high school age are tremendous. Constructive guidance of those young people requires a spirit of understanding, compassion, and tolerance of these changes.

Teachers desire the respect and compensation to which professionals are entitled. Inherent professionalism is based upon a sense of dedication and direction towards achieving the goals of the profession.

In the course of our study, we met any number of teachers who had these qualities. Although most teachers orally subscribed to the foregoing, many had the attitudes of the members in a good trade union. It is the Commission's belief that this is a corrosive element eating at the educational system.

Age and Cultural Gap

In its last report this Commission identified the difficulties encountered between the older and the younger in developing total rapport and understanding. In the course of the past year, we found the same gap between the teachers and the young.

This cleavage was observed in all parts of the State. However, once again, in the urban centers the problems were more evident.

Many teachers with personal backgrounds of middle class values and standards and educated in earlier years are unable to cope

with or understand the present day and changed student population. They are reluctant to, or incapable of, and resistant to change. This reaction is normal and not unique to teachers, but there is evidence that such reaction has a harmful effect, principally in developing an understanding for their pupils.

Large numbers of our present day student population come from backgrounds totally foreign to those of their teachers. With the influx of thousands of families from other states of the nation and from Puerto Rico, new students were introduced into the school system in massive numbers. Students from many of these families had totally different life styles from those of the teachers.

At the same time, curriculum and textbooks were foreign to the frustrated pupil. The youngster from dire poverty and often a background of a broken family finds it difficult to understand love or beauty as illustrated by a picture in the textbook of a small white boy and girl holding hands in a flower covered countryside.

Not only does the youngster fail to understand the teacher, but as a result of lack of understanding and communication he does not develop a sense of trust toward the teacher, and the faith and understanding which should be there to promote the learning experience.

How can a youngster coming from the Ghetto of Harlem and Bedford Stuyvesant and disadvantaged areas of other cities understand the attitudes and concepts of a different world, unless the teacher is able to relate to him by understanding the world in which he lives?

Faculty

It is apparent that little attempt has been made to teach through the concepts with which the youngster was familiar. Teaching a youngster who comes from an "asphalt jungle" requires teaching him, at the least in the beginning, in an "asphalt idiom". You cannot teach a youngster whose concepts of life have been shaped by constant exposure to dope addiction, policy games and lack of hope and a presence of continual despair, "how-now-brown-cow".

Teacher Qualifications

The concept of Boards of Examiners was established to prevent the use of the school system as a vehicle of political patronage. In short, the Boards were to be the guardians of a system designed to make sure that only those individuals best qualified to administer and supervise the operation of a school were chosen. It was their job to devise testing procedures to accomplish this laudable objective.

Today, only the City of New York has a Board of Examiners[1] granting certification to teachers and supervisors using regulations and requirements other than those of the State Department of Education. In the City of Buffalo, other standards are employed by members of the staff of the Board of Education in examination. The Boards and examiners have become superfluous and ineffective appendages. The State Department of Education maintains a division for the certification of teachers for the State of New York.

1. See Appendix E.

Faculty

A young graduate, certified by New York State to teach English in high school, recently wrote in the New York Times (March 22, 1971), about the New York City Board of Examiner test she took to obtain a license to teach in that City. She quoted two questions asked of her as a prospective English teacher:

The residence of the chief characters in the TV program "Bonanza" is

1. Custer City
2. The Bad Lands
3. Santa Fe
4. The Ponderosa Ranch

Hugh M. Hefner is the editor and publisher of

1. Ebony
2. The Village Voice
3. Ramparts
4. Playboy

Although the majority of the students in New York City Public Schools are either Black or Puerto Rican, the only question on the exam that dealt with Black experience in the United States spelled the first name of a nationally known figure as "Huie" rather than "Huey Newton".

Teachers relate that rules of the Board of Examiners and special examiners are depriving otherwise qualified state certified teachers from teaching in the city system, and from becoming administrators.

Many of these are young people most capable and able to relate to today's students' needs. Thus, the system is being denied the services of many teachers well qualified to serve in areas where they are desperately needed. Students say that if they feel the teacher understands them, if the teacher "relates", they do better

in the classes. If the teacher does not "relate", the students become frustrated and unrest follows.

The continuation of the Board of Examiners perpetuates a dual system within the state in determining qualified and eligible teachers, for which there is no justification.

Tenure

At present, administrators and school boards must decide at the end of the teacher's third year of teaching in the district whether to fire or to grant tenure.

This has at least two effects. A teacher whose ability is questionable may be given a contract and granted tenure and may never prove competent and remain a teacher in the school. A similar teacher, who might prove able with another year's experience, may be fired and lost to teaching. Young teachers especially mention that they fear being released, before they have proven themselves, because of the rules for granting tenure.

Tenure has been cited as necessary to obtain and retain competent teachers. There is a difference of opinion even among teachers as to value of tenure in attracting young people to the profession. The experience of having an incompetent teacher, when a student, may turn a student away from teaching as a career.

There are teachers in our school system who have tenure and who are considered incompetent by other teachers as well as by administrators, parents and students.

Within and outside the schools, there is sentiment that a method of review and accountability is needed and that there be a longer probationary period before tenure is granted.

Faculty

Teachers' Strikes

Each year threats of strikes, strikes and demonstrations by teachers are becoming more frequent and are disrupting and closing our schools.

Young people of high school and especially junior high school age are at an extremely vulnerable and sensitive stage of their lives. It is suggested that they desire to think of those elders closest to them as models. They are impressed by the actions of their teachers and of the people with whom they live. When these elders strike or demonstrate and disrupt and close the school, the student is deprived of the classroom time needed for learning and the guidance of his teachers.

Pupils see teachers' strikes as being for the teachers' advantage and not for the better education of the students. When teachers strike, they violate the law. When this fact is widely publicized, as it most often is, the student is aware that his teachers are law breakers. Even those students who has sympathized with a strike did not fail to grasp this lesson.

A review of the issues underlying these teachers' strikes reveals them to be principally related to status (professional), working conditions and financial gain.

Teacher remuneration, benefits and status should be commensurate with their professional ability, experience and performance and be determined by means other than the power of a strike.

Teachers' strikes are seen as dysfunctional and corrosive to the education of the student and a cause of student unrest.

ADMINISTRATION

The school principal's self-image based on restrictions which limit his ability to act immediately in response to events which cause disruption, was often related to the Commission. Principals report incidence of disruptive unrest because of restrictions on their capacity to act. In the larger cities, the high school principals operate under an umbrella policy and stringent procedural rules set down by higher administrators. Many of these principals feel that they should have more power to deal immediately, on-sight, with a disruptive problem. Disruptively inclined students appear to be fully aware of the limitations under which the administrators perform, and act accordingly.

The Commission heard from principals who felt that the ability to suspend students and the accompanying procedures should be clarified and strengthened. In supporting this position, in addition to disruptive demonstrations, they gave reports of crime and violence in the schools. Especially in the cities, principals told of acts of arson, assault, extortion, rape, riot, theft and vandalism.

Many urban principals felt that the problem of disruption is major and immediate.

New York City's Deputy Chancellor reflected the, "see, speak, and hear no evil", an attitude more common to the senior administrators.

He said when asked about vandalism,

"...I think that vandalism is a small problem."

When asked about assaults on teachers, said,

> "..In a school system of 60,000 teachers, the number of teachers that have been assaulted, or assaulted in their lifetime, is relatively small."

Who said, when asked about student extortion of students,

> "...It is entirely too prevalent, if it exists at all. I would say it is relatively minimal."

Who said, when asked about racial tensions in the city schools,

> "...That very infrequently has this unrest been of a racial nature."

Reports in the news media the day following questioned the veracity of the statements or the Vice Chancellor's knowledge of the facts.

The large concentration of students in one school whether by consolidation, or as the result of one district's large population, contributes to the administrator's and student's and faculty's problem. The grievances of students are not known to their teachers or administrators because the students do not feel there is anyone who will take the time to or cares to hear about them.

Teachers in these large schools say they do not have the time to establish meaningful face to face relationships with their students. This leads to student frustration, escalated grievances and often disruption.

Experiments in which the school is divided up into small administrative units with staff available and dedicated to the students, have performed generally successfully in maintaining a climate in which the learning processes can continue uninterrupted.

PARENTS

A supervisor noted the lack of interest of the parents in the education of their children. In contacts with students, this was found to be the case. The parents wish their children to be educated, but many have had little interest in what was going on in the school. There is evidence that this is changing, but considering the size of our State, the numbers of parents involved is reported as small, except in instances of specific confrontation.

Some disruption described to be caused by outside (the school) influences proved to be the activities of parents. These parents were deeply concerned about what was happening in the school, and wanting something better, banded together and closed the school. Such action, however well intentioned, is harmful to the students. These strikes, as do the teachers' strikes, impress the student that illegal obstruction is an acceptable concept.

These parents know that they are not experts in education, but they want their children to have the opportunity in life often not afforded to them. Especially in middle city, ghetto areas, parents stated that they cannot get the schools to react to their requests and demands for information and change.

The interest of these parents in their childrens' education is regarded as beneficial. Methods of meeting the parents' needs must be found in establishing better communication to prevent further disruptions.

It is evident that there is far too great a gap between the parents, the students' home environment, the school administration and the faculty.

CURRICULUM

The national emphasis on college education has promoted an equal emphasis for the college entrance curriculum. Because of this emphasis on college education, many more students enrolled in academic programs. As many of these students were not motivated to college education, but took these courses because of societal and parental pressure, schools developed less demanding but similarly titled courses. These latter courses led to graduation with a General or School diploma rather than a college entrance or specialized occupational one. The general diploma, often referred to as a certificate of attendance, only rarely prepared the graduate for a job or further education.

This situation led one teacher to say,

> "...Each year, there are fewer academic high schools worthy of the name."

Further, another felt,

> "We need to restore the dignity of the artisan."

Some practices affect both the college entrance and non-college bound. In a large metropolitan school with a high percentage of Puerto Rican students, the course arrangements are such that students with an English language difficulty, can only take three courses a semester. Similarly, the great number of students graduating from high school with grade school reading levels are victims of these practices.

The President of the New York City Board of Education said this year,

> "I would be fooling the public, and I don't intend to, by saying that I think that we have gotten to any point where there has been a

substantial improvement (in reading levels). There hasn't been."

The statute mandated programs are an example of the tendency to attempt to solve problems by adding courses and positions on top of the structure. These mandated courses which schools have in their general curriculum are often not pertinent to the student's general academic goals and needs. The mandating of maximum compliance with the statute is not only costly but it leaves no choice to the administrators in determining the needs of students and limits the choice students have in selecting courses. These restrictions on choice raise questions in the minds of the students as to the value of what they are doing in school and whether or not their time is well spent.

DISRUPTION AND ATTENDANCE

The incidence of disruptive unrest while not restricted to the metropolitan areas, is greater in the urban secondary schools of our State. In some city schools disruption is an almost daily occurrence.

Attendance has been reported as below 60% in some cases on a normal school day.

The practice of social promotion (advancing failing students to keep them with their age group) plays an important part in this low attendance and unrest. The child who can't do the work, who is not at the academic level of the grade he is in, resents his inability, causes disruption, becomes a disciplinary problem, eventually a truant. His behavior while in school is such as to retard the progress of his classmates.

As these disruptive students become older they become greater disciplinary problems and greater agents of disruption. An often mentioned group, an unknown number of these older students, attend at the school not to learn but to hang around.

Many of these students are not in school for the whole day or not in assigned classes, but by law there is a seat for each of them. The vacant seat has at least two effects. The other students see how many are out and apparently how easy it is to be out and be promoted. In addition the school has to provide, according to law, a place for the often absent student should he decide to attend.

Consequently, the maintenance of a place for him promotes truancy among others and contributes to overcrowding in other areas because vacant seats are maintained for the absent pupil.

Disruption and Attendance

The disruptions are not the single province of the academic non-achiever, or the truant. While these students are involved in disruptive unrest, achieving students are also.

All, or even most of the unrest, is not caused by poor academic achievement or truancy or overcrowding. Such simplistic answers have been advanced to the Commission during these studies. The complexity of the causes of unrest and the motivations for disruptive acts are revealed in the responses of the students, teachers and administrators. The issues which they say cause unrest in the schools include, but are not limited to, racial friction, environment, poverty, educational irrelevance, regimentation within the school, War in Southeast Asia, Kent State and Jackson State deaths, and what are identified as social, racial and cultural inequities.

One principal said,

> "You cannot equate education with order, but equally you cannot teach in constant turmoil."

Most faculty and students concur in this view.

Community leaders and parents, as well as the school community, are concerned in fear that non-achieving, disruptive young people be cast out of the school and lost to society.

For the younger pupils (16 years of age and under) such action would be illegal and improvident. In reference to the older (17 to 21 years of age), especially those who say they want to be in school but act as though they do not wish to be educated, it is felt that the present permissive law should be amended. The school should not be compelled to make a place for a

disruptive student in this age group who either requests to enroll or who is already attending and wishes to remain.

The present practice of transferring disruptive students to another but similar school, has not succeeded in motivating him to education. Most of the special schools, in which are placed those considered incorrigibly disruptive, are not succeeding. These special schools (in New York City, the 600 schools) have been described as "day hop prisons", often serving as custodial institutions for the length of the school day. Even where there is dedicated staff, and many are, there is insufficient staff and inadequate facilities and equipment.

The need for adjunctive schools, both public and private, with psychological and guidance as well as educational staff was often recommended to the Commission, in order to provide the disruptive student with the understanding and help not presently available in our school systems.

So long as attendance is compulsory to age 17, it is imperative for the orderly function of our secondary schools that some method be developed through which the disruptive student can be salvaged to his full potential for a productive life.

DRUGS

The Commission learned first hand, that in all parts of the State, in the large urban and even the small rural schools, the smoking of marijuana and the induction of hard narcotics has risen dramatically. This use is seen as both a symptom and a cause of unrest.

One suburban high school student, in speaking of his own school, told the Commission,

> "There is a growing drug problem. It isn't new and it is pretty extensive. I would estimate that a conservative estimate would be 75% to 90% of the students have tried marijuana at least once. ...as you go up the ladder on more potent drugs, you find less and less (use), although problems are developing in regard to heroin in particular..."

This statement, as well as others, leads to the conclusion that marijuana and hard narcotics are easily available to secondary school students. Measured by the continuing and growing numbers of young people involved, the narcotic instruction programs, where they exist, are not substantially succeeding or are not succeeding to the desired degree.

Students who have problems with drugs very often have no one to go to. If they go to anyone in the school, even a counselor, they fear exposure to the police. The counselor, if asked by law enforcement authorities, must give what information he has. These people do not have the immunity of physicians, the clergy and lawyers, which would allow them to withhold the information because of a confidential relationship with the student.

Many feel that such immunity should be given to the designated

drug counselors in the schools. They feel that if laws were passed to this effect, that the students would approach the counselors and get help.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Most of the private school students with whom the Commission spoke described their schools as having an open atmosphere where students participated and where there was communication among the members of the school community. These conditions promoted rapport and mutual respect.

These schools have the ability to select their students, but a teacher indicated that this can not be given as the only reason for the difference in atmosphere and student attitude. In these schools there is experimentation in which the student participates. There is far less mandating and far more choice.

Here there was evidence of what students from all types of schools had told the Commission. When they had more freedom to pursue their interests, the students' motivation is stimulated. In such a setting students appear to better accept courses not necessarily within their own spheres of interest.

These students report, and the teachers and administrators agree, that teachers and administrators are available to students outside the classroom for additional help and consultation.

While most private schools have less money for physical plant and faculty salaries than do the public schools, they have motivated young people to succeed in their educations. It is not great sums of money nor physical plant alone which make a successful school, but dedicated faculty and administration who care, understand and can motivate.

Pupils at some private schools are what [illegible]blic generally picture as private school students - white an[illegible] advantaged homes, this is not completely so.

At Harlem Preparatory School, however, we found white, black, Puerto Rican, American Indian, dropouts, rebels, the deprived, rejected and unwanted. They were being successfully educated. Teacher and administration recognize the pupil as a fellow human, despite background or problems. Students were assured that there is a place for them and people who care. It is not patronizing, but creates an atmosphere of trust, of challenge with mutual respect, and eventual pride in accomplishment.

If this is successful in the private sector, with all types of schools and students, it should work in the public system. Teachers and administration must recognize their pupils as vital, curious, exuberant human beings with individual differences and individual characteristics, but desirous of stimulation and challenge to better themselves by education.

PHYSICAL PLANT

The physical plant of the secondary public system in our State runs the gamut from old and decrepit to new and vandalized with a mixture of teaching tools and equipment ranging from impressive to wholly inadequate.

Some schools are relatively new and others are as old as fifty and sixty years. In the schools, equipment and tools are also old and new. However, the age of the tools and equipment does not sufficiently account for the fact that they are not used most appropriately.

Little evidence was presented to a correlation between the quality of education and the physical plant.

In many of the disadvantaged areas the physical facilities, materials and equipment were inferior to those found elsewhere. This was especially true in the libraries. In both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged areas, the Commission observed that students were denied access to the library for periods of weeks at a time while it was being used by teachers for non-teaching purposes.

Many of the schools were dull and drab with the appearance of penal institutions complete with bars and wires on the windows. In others, though new and modern, there was a depressive stolid atmosphere.

There appears to be no equality of internal facilities, and no recognition that the facilities were for teaching the students, rather than for the convenience of someone else.

THE BOARD OF REGENTS AND COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The powers of the Department of Education and its Commissioner are derived from the Legislature. Although the Board of Regents is constitutionally created, they are elected by the Legislature and their powers are created by statute.

The Commission is regarding both the Board of Regents and the State Education Department jointly because of their joint responsibility for our educational system.

With intent to provide the youth of this State the best possible opportunity for an education, the Legislature has granted the Board of Regents and the Commissioner literal autonomy. Their powers to plan, supervise, administer and examine the State's educational system are virtually unlimited, subject only to statutes. Yet, despite the breadth of these powers and the budgets under which they operate, our educational system is failing many young people.

The people of New York State have been generous in expenditures for education. In the hope that these sums will provide the best possible education for our young people, New York State now expends more per pupil than any other State.

With so many crucial issues confronting our educational system, it is deplorable that the valuable time and effort of the Education Commissioner should be spent on such trifling determinations as the proper length of a student's hair, the propriety of girls' slacks or dress, whether a female teacher should appear before a physical education class in a bikini, etc. Nevertheless, the Commission is convinced that these subjects

contribute to unrest.

In the particular area of secondary school unrest, it was difficult to obtain accurate, current and significant information from the Education Department because it was not currently available. There was no reluctance or unwillingness on the part of the Department to cooperate in supplying information that was available.

For example, such information as the number of schools that had unrest and the cost in dollars to repair the schools of the State after acts of vandalism was not obtainable.

FUNDING

The people of our State are deeply concerned and exercised over the costs of educating our young people. Such concern has been vigorously expressed relative to the budgets of our schools and Department of Education. It has been expressed as to the allocation of appropriated funds for education and with the results of the educational process in our public schools.

At the beginning of Part I of this report it was pointed out that the day to day exposures of the students outside the school color his attitudes in the school. The home environment's attitudes concerning education play an important part in the student's motivation toward learning and his conduct in the school.

While most segments of society are willing to and want to properly educate young people, many question the funds requested by school boards and the Department of Education. It was pointed out that when budgets are defeated and subsequently passed at lower figures, or when the appropriation for the Department of Education is cut, that the education of the children does not seem to suffer.

It has been suggested that the educators do not keep good business records. Very often they request sums far in excess of their needs, that if the requests were realistic and undisguised, the budgets would less often be defeated or appropriations cut.

When educators make requests for sums later proven to be excessive, the people lose faith in them and in the system. This attitude is often absorbed by the young people. The defeat of

school budgets was a mentioned issue as a cause of unrest by the secondary students surveyed by the Commission.

Schools with a high percentage of students with learning problems receive special funds for remediation. Frequently when students are transferred from these schools as a part of integration, the special funds do not follow the students. In their new school, there are few or no programs to help these students overcome their learning difficulties, with the resultant criticism that the money being spent is disproportionate to the number of students.

While integration is being accomplished, the transferred students do not receive and are being denied needed remedial assistance. Both the transferred students and their parents cite this as a cause of unrest.

In districts with many secondary schools, parents, teachers and administrators related that the pilot project schools were syphoning off the educational resources needed for the regular programs resulting in an inequitable distribution of available funds. While most felt these special schools had value, it was said that in serving the few students, greater numbers were getting inferior services.

They further related that when controversy arose about these funds and those of urban education, the school boards and the Commissioner of Education were so slow in making decisions, that the situation often grew to acrimony and demonstrations, while the students were the losers.

Aware of the amount of unrest in our secondary schools, the number of dropouts, the number of students deficient in the

basic courses (math and reading), the often poor guidance and the continuation of methods apparently long outdated, the public has begun to question the value given for the dollar spent.

Educating the many young people of our State demands great expenditure. However, each expenditure must be clearly justified. There must be financial accountability and justified financial projection as well as auditing.

In any component of the educational system where these are lacking, there exists the risks of appropriating too much money and approving excessive budgets, or appropriating too little to do the job and approving inadequate budgets. In either event, dissatisfaction and unrest results.

DESIRE FOR CHANGE

New York City's new Chancellor, Harvey Scribner, recently stated at a public hearing of the New York State (Fleishman) Commission on Education, that a fundamental change was needed,

> "... in what we define as education, in what we view as the purpose of the schools. The essential question which confronts the schools of New York City today, as well as those of other cities, is whether they can reshape themselves in order to serve a larger proportion - ideally all - of their students in more useful ways. Given the rapidly changing society and culture, there is every reason to reorient public education toward new goals."

In the same statement he went on to say that,

> "Many of the contemporary troubles of the schools can be traced at least in part to the fact that the schools were designed in large measure for a different time, a different kind of society and for a nation which was less mobile, less urban, less industrialized, less pressured by the economic necessity of education and less affected by mass media. We need to refrain from defining school reform merely in terms of buildings, schedules, equipment, materials and groupings of students."

If acted upon, statements such as these from the Chancellor of the nation's biggest system gives cause for hope. It not only shows an awareness of the problems as we found them, but a desire to approach the problems, a desire for change.

PART I

SECTION III

RECOMMENDATIONS

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS)

Recommendations to the Parents and People:

1.) That the people in the community served by the school, and not only the parents, make every effort to take advantage of whatever communication is presently available to learn of the mission of the schools and how the schools are meeting that mission; to open more channels of communication wherever possible.

2.) To carefully obtain and carefully weigh all information about the school before arriving at any conclusions.

3.) To attend the meetings of the School Boards, as well as the budget meetings.

4.) To become fully aware of the activities in the school by visiting and observing and conferring with members of the administration, faculty and guidance personnel.

5.) To gain knowledge of courses available to students and especially in the case of parents, maintain a continuous awareness of the student's progress.

6.) To refrain from setting a bad example and contributing to student unrest by violent or disruptive acts that deprive students of the use of the schools.

7.) To encourage the use of the school as a community center and not as a battleground for factional disputes.

Recommendations to School Administrators and Boards of Education:

1.) That the practice, procedures and methods of granting tenure to teachers be studied and that a periodic review of teacher effectiveness should be included in the continuing employment of teachers.

2.) That teacher strikes are inimical to the proper continuity of the education of our young people. That the participants in such strikes, which interrupt the educational process, be dealt with to the full extent of existing law.

3.) That the practice of social promotion (advancing failing students with their age group) be discontinued as it contributes to unrest in the schools.

4.) That the authority of administrators and faculty to deal with disruptions and to enforce discipline be clarified. That in any clarification there be included not only procedures of disciplining but also due process and determination without delay.

5.) That every effort should be made to open effective lines of communication between and among all members of the community both in the school and with the general public.

6.) Since narcotics in rural, and suburban as well as urban

Recommendations to School Administrators and Boards of Education:

schools are both a cause and symptom of unrest, that there be fullest cooperation with the local community to take full advantage of the State and Federal aid programs which have not been fully utilized in the past. That serious consideration be given to establishing, within the school, drug counsellors with whom students with drug problems can consult in confidence.

7.) That there be developed guidelines and plans for dealing with major disruptions so that in the event of such, all will know their duties and responsibilities as well as their rights.

8.) That every effort should be made to include members of the community, including students and parents, in the operations of the school in policy, programming and curriculum, and not just budget and building approval.

9.) That a thorough examination be made of the administration, curriculum and rules for behavior to find and identify the areas of rigid adherence to the past and to institute changes which will meet today's needs.

10.) That programs be developed which renew the dignity of the manual arts and trades in addition to the present occupational and BOCES programs.

Recommendations to the School Faculties: (Secondary Schools)

1.) That members of the faculty should make every effort to establish and maintain an individual relationship with students wherever and whenever possible. That they be aware of their responsibility to the students as molders of character and developers of motivation in addition to their tasks as classroom teachers.

2.) That faculties join with administration and school boards in examining curriculum, rules of conduct and administration to remove the appearance and reality of rigid adherence to the past.

3.) That they, as individuals, and as members of local and other teacher organizations, together with administration and the school board, examine the procedures and methods by which teacher accountability is periodically measured.

4.) That as members of the school community, to fully employ and augment lines of communication with the members of the general community, especially the parents and students.

5.) That faculty reject teacher strikes as a means of solving problems.

Recommendations to the Students:

1.) That they reject violence and disruptions as a means and/or method of achieving change.

2.) That they accept the basic educational system and work through legitimate means for change.

3.) That they develop a tolerance and understanding of the efforts being made on their behalf by those who are not students.

4.) That they exert every effort to establish a better understanding and more rational communication with parents and school personnel.

Recommendations to the Board of Regents and the Commissioner of Education

1.) That there should be provided a system of psychological and guidance services, particularly for those who show a constant tendency to be disruptive; with further provision for remedial educational facilities in both the public and private sector, as is now provided for the physically and mentally handicapped.

2.) That the method of awarding Regents Scholarships be examined to determine the feasibility of extending the period that a scholarship winner has to start his studies; so that a winner does not have to forfeit should he choose not to enroll in a post-secondary school in the September immediately following high school graduation.

3.) That Regents Scholarships be made available to students entering any certified post-secondary school or community college.

4.) That those students preparing to be elementary and secondary school teachers be required to undergo a period of teaching internship, or its equivalent, of not less than three years, all as an integral part of teacher certification requirements in New York State.

5.) That the prescribed curriculum for prospective teachers leading to teacher certification be constantly examined and revised to meet changing conditions and current needs.

6.) That programs be pressed forward to develop school settings devoid of rigidity and inflexibility with the objective of providing schools which will serve the needs of the students and the community as well.

7.) That immediate action be taken to determine viable alternative methods of relieving overcrowding in the secondary schools of our State pending new construction.

8.) That there be developed a method of maintaining and making available by the Department of Education current reports of unrest and their severity in the schools.

9.) That existing programs for training in the manual arts and trades be intensified where they exist and further implemented.

10.) That the Regents' Rules and/or Commissioner's Regulations mandating school positions and courses be examined to rescind those which are not educationally relevant.

11.) That there be an in-depth review of the system of teacher certification in the Department of Education to develop relevant and progressive standards.

12.) That it is recommended that in order to provide greater financial accountability every school district provide current reports, such reports together with recommendation and comment by the Department of Education to be available to the Legislature.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNOR AND TO THE LEGISLATURE:

1.) Amend those laws relative to attendance of students over the age of seventeen years to permit secondary schools to remove from their rolls such students who are disruptive.

2.) Amend the laws controlling the suspension of students below the age of seventeen years to insure expeditious disposal of cases and to provide for the students' placement, where appropriate, in an alternate educational setting with psychological and guidance services.

3.) That the law granting immunity from testifying and prosecution to professionals who receive confidential or privileged communications from clients or patients be extended to include authorized school counsellors from whom students with drug problems would seek aid.

4.) That the Board of Examiners in the City of New York and examiners in Buffalo be abolished as they add to administrative rigidities and bureaucratic inertia.

5.) That teacher strikes are inimical to education and a cause of unrest among students; that the "Taylor Law" be re-examined to ascertain its effectiveness within the educational system.

Recommendations to Governor and Legislature

6.) That all school districts in the State of New York be directed by law to file with the Board of Regents and the Commissioner of Education, rules for the regulation by the schools of the conduct on school grounds and in all buildings used for educational purposes at the secondary level.

7.) That the present system of granting tenure be revised to provide for longer probationary periods and to include periodic evaluation of teacher effectiveness.

8.) That the Commissioner of Education be required to provide the Legislature with current reports detailing comparative per pupil costs for all school districts in the State.

9.) That the laws mandating school positions, costs, and courses be examined to repeal those which are not educationally relevant or valuable.

10.) That the recodification and simplification of the Education Law be continued and expedited.

11.) Extend the Commission to serve as a Conservator in constant surveillance of the progress being made, by those responsible at all levels of education, in eliminating the causes of unrest.

12.) Extend the Commission to continue its inquiry in and scrutiny of the following areas:

a.) The effects of the Open Admissions policies;

Recommendations to Governor and Legislature

b.) The formulation and implementation of effective grievance procedures for all members of the academic community;

c.) The response of the universities and colleges to the recommendations of the Commission;

d.) The response of the New York State Department of Education, the Board of Regents and district schools' boards to the recommendations of the Commission;

e.) The impact of as well as the procedures and methods of achieving the further development of special schools for the culturally deprived;

f.) Supervision and study of the strengthening of the remedial programs at the elementary and secondary school levels;

g.) The effectiveness of the use of public funds in education in eliminating unrest;

h.) The amendments needed in the regulations, rules and statutes in order to establish in our secondary and elementary school systems a greater relevance to today's requirements.

PART II

HIGHER EDUCATION

PREFACE

PART II, HIGHER EDUCATION

The report submitted by this Commission on February 1, 1970 dealt with the colleges and universities in the State. One of our most important recommendations of last year's report was a study of unrest in the secondary schools and its relation to unrest in higher education. The results of that study to date appear in Part I of this report and in the survey reports in the appendix.

Further, it was recommended that there be a study of the impact of special funds upon the quality of education and the dimensions and impacts of the Open Admissions Policy. The special funds examined were those funds for remedial purposes to ease the problems of the poorly prepared student entering college. While there have been conflicting attitudes about Open Admissions and the remedial programs, they appear to be making progress.

The Commission last year recommended that the universities and colleges be given an opportunity to solve their own problems. By and large, the administrators and faculty, along with the students did not take this lightly, but on the contrary are attempting to respond. We commend those schools and those components of the academic communities in higher education for their efforts to effectuate the changes which obviously were so necessary.

We do not mean by the foregoing that every single university or college today is perfect. We urge very strongly that further efforts be made in changing their structures of governance to insure due process guarantees to all members of the academic community.

Preface Part II Higher Education

It was found that at some campuses and large universities the administrators and trustees did not have specific records of crimes committed on the campus.

When disruptive unrest threatened, it was found, especially at units of the State University, that there was no immediate legal advice available to the administrators. In such situations grievances have escalated to disruption and might in the future.

Our surveys show that the serious types of unrest, direct and indirect confrontations, occurred in the medium and large co-educational institutions. The most serious of these instances were in the largest schools. However, any further development of identification of potential unrest is impossible without instant and correlated reports of restive activity and disruptive unrest from the institutions.

It was recommended that a study be made of the methods of collection, distribution, control and accountability of students' activity fees. Since that recommendation was made, the subject has assumed even further importance in the minds of the public, administrators and students. An investigation conducted by the Comptroller of the State of New York of selected units of the State University as well as our own study demonstrated that the accounting practices and accountability procedures in connection with these funds were often deficient. Instances were found where these funds were being used to support activities to which many students, parents and the general public objected.

Preface Part II Higher Education

What the goals of the university and college are and whether they should be active or neutral institutions in bringing about social change are questions not yet answered. Both on and off the campus disagreement continues.

That which follows represents the results of the gathering of many kinds of evidence.

Traditionally, educators have kept poor business records and the statistical information was too often limited and lacked uniformity. Where data was available it was used in the study.

With limited resources, it was necessary to rely on surveys, the observations of those who appeared at the hearings, conferences, interviews, and symposia as well as examination and in-depth inquiry into reports and communications received by the Commission to verify their validity.

PART II

SECTION I

STRUCTURE of HIGHER EDUCATION

in NEW YORK STATE

Structure of Higher Education in New York State

Student unrest occurred at approximately 75% of the institutions of higher learning in New York State in the Spring of 1970. A focus on the complexity of this problem may be gained by examining the structure of higher education in this State. The following tables portray this structure, ranging from large public state and city systems to private two year schools.

Institutional Enrollments*: The data include full and part-time degree credit and nondegree credit enrollment for all institutions.

Type of Administration	Fall 1968	Fall 1969	Fall 1970
Public	377,021 51.5%	399,725 52.7%	447,489 57.9%
Private	355,554 48.5%	358,950 47.3%	325,621 42.1%
Total State	732,575 100.0%	758,675 100.0%	773,110 100.0%

Over the three year period beginning with Fall 1968, the number of students enrolled in State colleges and universities has increased by 40,535. The majority of this increase has been reflected by the public institutions whose enrollments have been steadily increasing. Enrollments in private institutions have fallen by 6.4%. Another interesting trend indicates that enrollment patterns are changing according to type of institution as well as type of administration.

---

*Data from New York State Education Department: College and University Enrollment, New York State, Fall 1970. (Albany: Information Center on Education). 1970

Structure of Higher Education

Type of Institution	Fall 1968	Fall 1969	Fall 1970
Public and Private 4 year or more institutions	564,547 77.1%	580,722 76.6%	576,714 74.6%
Public and Private 2 year institutions	168,028 22.9%	177,953 23.4%	196,396 25.4%
Total State	732,575 100.0%	758,675 100.0%	773,110 100.0%

The table shows that students are increasingly entering 2-year institutions whether public or private.

Postsecondary Enrollment of New York State High School Graduates

In 1968-69*, 223,297 students graduated from the public and nonpublic high schools of New York State. Of these, 53.1% continued their education in institutions of higher learning in New York State. From the remaining 46.9%, 15.5% enrolled in institutions outside of New York State and 31.4% entered the job market, military service, or some other type of activity. The table below indicates the distribution of these students in schools throughout the State.

Type of School	Number of 1968-69 H. S. Graduates Enrolled	Percentage of 1968-69 H. S. Graduates Enrolled
4 year colleges	61,853	27.7%
2 year colleges	44,213	19.8%
Professional and other types of institutions	12,505	5.6%
Total entering institutions of higher learning	118,571	53.1%

*These are the most current figures available. They are from New York State Education Department; Distribution of High School Graduates and College-Going Rate, New York State. (Albany: Information Center on Education). Fall 1970

Degrees Conferred by New York State Institutions of Higher Education. The following figures are for the school year 1968-69. They are the most recent figures available.

Type of Degree	Number of Students Receiving Degree
Associate Degrees	24,111
Bachelors Degrees	66,331
Masters Degrees	24,487
Doctoral Degrees	3,337
Professional Degrees	3,596
Total Degrees.....	121,862

The number of degrees conferred in New York State increased by approximately 20% between the years 1966-67 and 1968-69.

Distribution of Ethnic Groups in New York State Institutions

A study by the New York State Education Department analyzed the enrollment of four ethnic groups in New York State institutions of higher learning in the Fall of 1970. The four groups were (1) American Indian; (2) Negro; (3) Oriental; and (4) Spanish Surnamed American (SSA). The percentage distribution of these students is indicated in the table below. The numbers given are percentages of the total school enrollments.

	Percent of Students Enrolled by Ethnic Type				
Type of Institution	American Indian	Negro	Oriental	SSA(a)	Total Ethnic Enrollment
Public Undergraduate	0.2%	7.5%	1.2%	2.7%	11.6%
Private Undergraduate	0.4%	3.6%	1.1%	1.6%	6.7%
Total Undergraduate	0.3%	6.2%	1.1%	2.3%	9.9%
Public Graduate	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	0.7%	6.5%
Private Graduate	0.4%	3.8%	1.4%	1.4%	7.0%
Total Graduate	0.3%	3.5%	1.9%	1.1%	6.8%
Total State	0.3%	5.9%	1.2%	2.2%	^o.6%

(a) Spanish Surnamed American

The table reveals that more members of ethnic groups are entering the undergraduate rather than the graduate schools. In both cases ethnic enrollments are not large. At the undergraduate level ethnic students are enrolled more frequently in the public schools with the Negro students having the largest representation. The pattern changes at the graduate level. The public and private graduate schools have almost equal ethnic enrollments, with that of the private schools being slightly larger. The percentage of students from each ethnic classification becomes more equalized at this level. The percentage of Negro and Spanish Surnamed American students is smaller than at the undergraduate level, while the number of Oriental students has increased. In the public graduate schools the Oriental and Negro students are equally represented.

Survey Results. Of the 212 institutions of higher education in New York State, 203 responded to the Commission's "Status Survey of College Unrest II For the Latter Part of the Spring 1970 Semester." Administrators from these colleges and universities supplied the following profile data.

Undergraduate Enrollment	Number of Schools
700 or less students	68
701 - 2,000	49
2,001 - 5,000	38
5,001 - 10,000	19
10,001 - 22,000	10

Graduate Enrollment	Number of Schools
1500 or less students	63
1501-8300	24
15,000+	1

Percentage of Students Holding Regents Scholarships	Number of Schools
0.9% - 15.0%	138
15.1% - 50.0%	52
50.1% - 80.0%	13

Of the surveyed schools, 159 were co-educational, 26 were all-female, and 18 were all-male.

PART II

SECTION II

HIGHER EDUCATION

1970 - 1971

ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Traditionally, the University was conceived as a community of scholars, students and faculty, insulated from the political and social pressures of the greater society; an enclave where the knowledge of the past was imparted to the younger generation.

To ensure to the students and faculty this uninterrupted freedom from outside concerns, there was added the administrator who would take care of the necessary mundane features of the University. As the University grew in size and became more complex, it was the administrator and not the faculty or student in whom the power of internal governance and accountability came to rest.

Thus, the administrators established tuition, controlled finance, codes of conduct and the internal and external policy of the institution. They became the substitute parents for the students and the employers of the faculty. The chief administrator came to exercise total authority and total power. Throughout this evolution the concept of the insulated sanctuary of scholars continued, with the exception, especially in America, of preparing young people to perform specific tasks in the society on graduation.

This involvement with preparation for specific performance brought the University in greater contact with its supporting society. The purposes became teaching, of the old and new found knowledge; research to examine the areas of specific performance in society; and public service in supplying trained persons and advanced methodology to the society. In this research old truths were questioned, values were examined. In the tradition of

academic freedom the Universities were free to conduct these examinations without restrictions from any source.

To preserve this academic freedom, the University felt that it had to refrain from taking positions in the functions of the greater society. Tacit in this approach was the University's retreat from institutional statements affecting the society and a corresponding absence of interference in the internal workings of the University by the society at large.

The growth in specialization of the society and the similar growth of specialists and specialized departments in the University greatly increased interaction between the two. The society brought its problems with funds for specific research to the University, and the departments and individual specialists responded to these many requests with data and opinions. At the request of the society many of the University specialists entered government.

As a result, the students became current and concerned with the questions being asked. Some faculty and some students became concerned not with the answers to the questions being asked, but with the propriety of the questions themselves and the societal priorities represented by these questions.

It is these priority debates which often lead to unrest. It is these priority debates within the University and the accompanying demonstrative action on and off the campus that suggests a change in the concept of mutual non-involvement between the University and the greater society.

Role of the University

The evolution was in practice a great deal more complex, but the gross factors were apparent.

Among educators and society the debate of what is the role of the University in our society continues and intensifies. However, the consensus remains among college communities that while the members of the community must be free to express as they choose, as any other member of society, the University as an institution should refrain from positions in matters other than those relating to education and the preservation of the University. Both educators and members of society have frequently said that this is particularly true in light of the University's apparent inability to manage itw own affairs.

While administrators and older faculty generally hold to the preceding view, many of the students and younger faculty want the University to take broader institutional positions in public matters.

A SENSE OF COMMUNITY

The impersonal atmosphere surrounding a student on a college campus is often cited as a contributor to the aura of restiveness. The national concept that all who desire shall have post-secondary education and the resultant explosive growth in individual colleges and universities have been contributors to the impersonal atmosphere.

Those universities and colleges which had existed for a number of years, expanded their campuses to accommodate the influx of students. At the same time, there developed an explosive growth of new schools which often grew to monstrous size at a single location. Educational administrators who fostered the belief and persistently demanded that large centers of education would attract the most competent of faculty, would allow for the maximum use of sophisticated expensive resources and the maximum employment of physical capital structure, promoted this development.

There is a growing concern that this corporate-like development, while attempting to meet the previously mentioned goals, has brought with it a serious problem of student-institution identification.

It is reported that students do not feel that, "this is my school". It is an institution at which I am regulated, while I get a Bachelor's degree to better my opportunities in the world. Some of the negative attitudes of students and faculty toward the university stem from this feeling that the university is something other than themselves; that they are neither a part of it, nor is it a part of them. Students and faculty express the feeling

that undergraduate school, especially, is but another of the institutional rungs on the ladder of institutions which one must climb in our society.

It is felt that the development of a sense of community is salient to promotion of involvement on the part of the great mass of students who today are not involved in the maintenance, preservation or well-being of the university they attend.

At some units of the State University, there has been introduced the residence college. Simply described, this is an attempt to develop a sense of community belonging, by identifying with a given-name residence hall. While admittedly a move in the direction of fostering this spirit, its success is questioned by the participants.

A further experiment is suggested, in which large university centers would be divided into colleges of area studies. At the undergraduate level for instance, these colleges would be in the disciplines of Social Sciences, the disciplines of Natural Sciences, Engineering, Fine Arts, etc. This type of institution might not be geographically any larger than those which exist today, but each would be particularly named, e.g., "The Magill College of Social Science at the State University Center at Stonybrook". The students would develop an identity and a sense of community within this college structure. At the same time, they would recognize their membership in the greater whole, the University Center. Students from these smaller colleges would necessarily travel across campus to take elective courses at other colleges, and in this way relate to the greater institution.

A Sense of Community

These smaller colleges within the University Center would have facilities for teaching, recreation and living, particularly identifiable as a part of the college.

It is suggested that this type of development would preserve the activities of research and publication, while it promotes closer ties and greater identification between and among students and professors. Additionally, the large university community, which has become clearly unmanageable in the eyes of many, would become more manageable when subdivided into smaller academic communities.

However, given the development of such a university community, its success will be determined by an acceptance and tolerance on the part of the students of efforts being made on their behalf by those other than students.

TRENDS ON THE CAMPUS

As shown in our last report, in recent years students have been demanding relevant positions on the various administrative committees and boards of the University. These positions are on committees concerned with the food in the student unions, faculty employment, retention and tenure, curriculum, degree requirements, determination of disciplinary policy, disciplinary committees themselves, general University policy and the Boards of Trustees.

Some administrators said that where students have been included, the students have not taken part to a meaningful degree. In these cases the students feel these committees are facades, that they do not have the power in them that the committee structure indicates.

The faculties have been demanding and have received a greater voice on various committees of University governance and administration. The members of the faculties report that their desire to serve in these positions stems from what they see as a need of the University to reflect a consensus. However, to have meaningful participation in the University governance takes time from teaching, counseling, research and publishing.

The method of rating college faculty continues to be the amount and quality of research publication. The faculty generally says that they feel that they should spend more time in face-to-face meetings with their students. Faculties say the number of students per faculty member is slowly increasing.

That critics of the University are pointing to the quality of the teaching, which includes student consultation. The

teachers relate that the amount of time necessary to prepare for classes for greater numbers of students, to do research and publish, severely limits their ability to meet with the students individually.

It is obvious that a method of rating faculty members other than the convenient research and publishing measure has to be found. While there has been a great deal of lip service given to the search for this measure, it has rarely gone past the statement that another method is needed.

It appears that in matters of general governance, on those campuses where a truly representative "all community" body has been empowered, there has been an active participation by members of the community in the governance and administration.

There appears to be a calmer climate on those campuses where the members of the community or their representatives have:

1. Worked together to establish rules and the sanctions for violation of those rules,
2. in a way that the entire community understands what the consequences of these violations are, and,
3. have established an authority to enforce the rules.

In these communities where there is greater involvement and leadership by faculty and students, there is corresponding responsibility to avoid participation in violent, destructive, disruptive acts which violate the rights of others.

The experience of 1967-69 clearly showed that unrest was evidenced by activist elements in moves against the University or

college at which they were enrolled. In the Spring of 1970 this was not the case.

Although the internal questions of student and faculty involvement in governance and administration, student activities fees, parietal rules, etc., continued to be present, they were overshadowed by an apparent wave of resentment against the immediate action in Southeast Asia and the deaths of the students at Kent State and Jackson State.

Students, faculty and administration joined together and publicly expressed their sentiment of "anti-Southeast Asia involvement."

It was expressed that in this common effort there grew a greater understanding in each of the segments; administrators, students and faculty, of the aspirations, problems and frustrations of each of the other segments. There evolved a process of easier communication which opened avenues for discussion of school matters in addition to the then paramount discourse about national priorities.

The aura on the campuses of this State this year was almost unanimously reported as being more quiet. This was often characterized as an apathy on the part of students.

This characterization is oversimplified and probably in error. That the number of activists is smaller than last year; and particularly last Spring, should not be read as a lack of concern on the part of students. They are concerned, though inactive.

In the Spring of 1970, from May first on, many more of the

moderate students, not previously actively involved, became active. Students who had never demonstrated nor signed petitions nor belonged to groups making demands, became greatly concerned about the movement in Cambodia and the Kent State and Jackson State deaths, and reacted in an activist way.

Some of these students, this year, are not active and their inactivity is thought to be because of their belief that mass demonstration on campus, State Capitols or at the National Capitol, will be counter-productive, and any apparent gains far outweighed by the reaction of the greater population.

Other of these moderate students have concluded that demonstrative action produces no positive lasting result. They believe this method is wrong and they have chosen a status of concerned inactivity and conscientious scholarship. They feel that once they have concluded their academic programs and are no longer part of the "student class", their ability to promote systemic change will be greater.

Numbers of students have been completely turned-off by their apparent inability to gain a response, to bring about early and dramatic changes in the attitude and actions of the "establishment". They accept none of the values of the college community or of the greater society and are merely putting in time. These few are truly apathetic.

Additionally, another group also view the previous tactics of confrontation and demonstration as being non-productive. They feel that change cannot be brought about within the American System of government and life. Although they have become radicalized, they are opposed to violence and destruction as a means

of reaching their goals.

The radical left still exists on the campuses of the State of New York in small groups with the continued belief that they will be able to win support from the greater body of students, on some, as yet undefined issue. This radical left has been increasingly unable to muster this support, appears to be losing support and is becoming fragmented.

The radical extremists, now commonly called the "crazies" by the campus community, have for the most part left the campus; dropped out of school. This group of revolutionary leaders, who for some time believed that the academy, with its ultimate tolerance of intellectual expression, is the most vulnerable of institutions, now believe that even here they have not been able to enlist adequate numbers to man the barricade of their revolution and have departed.

The great fear expressed by political leaders and all segments of the college community is that these crazies, now completely underground, existing in very small numbers and competing with each other for support and attention, will turn to even greater violence than that which the society has already experienced. It is feared that the tactic of hit and run, of placing a bomb and fleeing, will escalate.

The great majority of those contacted described the present climate on campuses as an uneasy calm. While the foregoing typology is presently descriptively valid, an issue could arise which would mobilize and possibly radicalize the campuses. This same majority agrees that this issue would not be internal to a campus, but would be responsive to an issue of national dimension.

OPEN ADMISSIONS AND MINORITY STUDENTS

There are segments of the society which as a minority have not and do not share in the American affluence. The upward mobility of these minority groups is best achieved through education. The Open Admissions policy inaugurated by the City University of New York, is an attempt to meet the needs of these groups.

The evidence is that students attending, and those who have graduated from inner-city elementary and secondary schools, in the minority areas, are receiving inferior preparation for a college education. The program of higher education, being devised by, and predicated upon and administered according to majority social values and experience, is in itself foreign to many of these minority young people.

Growing up in a community very different from that of the average college student and speaking the patois of his peers and environment, he finds academic English something of a foreign language.

He is beset by very real problems. Often he has been advanced through the grades of grammar and high school, without any real measurement of his previous educational experience or his readiness to advance. Many teachers are reluctant to teach in these neighborhood schools. Some community groups are reluctant to accept teachers and administrators unless they have particular ethnic or racial origins. The student has been the victim of these conflicts.

Open Admissions and Minority Students

Many teachers are unable to relate to the student's life style and his problems in living and getting educated. These teachers often live in communities far from the school site; they rarely have any experience or participation within the school's greater community and they speak in an idiom other than that of the students.

Until recently, the materials used in the lower grades of the elementary school, were related to the life of the middle class majority and had little meaning to the young ghetto students; and similarly, the standard tests measuring achievement and readiness.

These children are often members of families of limited education and training, and low income. The statement, "last hired - first fired" is both real and apparent. These children too often are poorly clothed, under-fed and sickly. They very often have a tradition of despair. These are obvious conditioners of their lack of motivation and therefore their ability to succeed in the even admittedly sub-standard school.

Until this setting is changed, and the student's experience in the elementary and secondary school prepares him for immediate entrance into the non-academic society or for higher education, educational opportunity programs will need to continue.

Rectifying these conditions as seen in the elementary and secondary schools will take not only a massive social attitude change but require a number of years, judged by some to be as many as fifteen. A most important element in this advance is the educated minority group member. There are senior high school

students who have not had equal opportunity in getting the quality of education to ready them to meet the challenge of higher education. This becomes more urgent when it is realized that the concept of Open Admissions gives promise of a college education and rekindles the hope of a better life.

The successful answer to how these young people will be educated will go a long way toward eliminating a major cause of educational and social unrest.

Although the costs must be considered, experience indicates that innovative methods are often as important to solution as are massive infusions of money.

The question of how they will be educated may be answered in many ways, such as but not restricted to the following:

1.) It is suggested that there be a post-secondary, pre-college educational program, which will ready the students for college work. That this task of preparation, remediation, should not be the concern of colleges and universities with their expensive, disciplinary specialists, but adjuncts of the secondary school system.

2.) There are those who support a second type of program: the Open Admissions program being pursued by the City University of the City of New York.

Open Admissions has been in existence for a short period of time and yet as of the date of this report, in the City University of New York alone, 3,335 students have generated 18,986 credits in courses offered solely and entirely within

the SEEK Program alone. Additionally, 4,827 SEEK students achieved 48,449 regular course credits and 2,212 students spent 15,671 contract hours in non-credit courses. These experiences have been teaching the sponsors of the program, both administration and faculty, new and better ways to remedy the academic-cultural gap.

2a.) There is another phase of the Open Admissions Program which must be examined. It has been expressed that the student cannot wait during a period in a special remediation school and that he must be freely admitted to the colleges and universities where there are special programs. Such programs demand of the student much additional work if he is to save the time and graduate from college after four years.

In such a situation it is often not enough to give the minority student free tuition and remediation. In such a program he has not the time to earn the necessary funds to support himself and, not infrequently, to help support his family. To provide this the government, Federal, State and Local, will need to expend much additional money. It has been variously suggested that these figures range from $1,000 to $2,500 a year, given individual circumstance. Experience in the predominantly black colleges of our country has shown that the majority of the students that drop out in their early college career, do so for monetary reasons.

3.) A third proposal, which in fact modifies the previous plan, suggests the removal of the sanctity of the four-year

college program and the development of a classless institution of higher learning. In such an institution, students would not be classified according to the traditional, but would advance to a place of competency and degree; this, irrespective of the number of years involved. Here too there would be remedial programs for these particular students. By giving lighter schedules they would be able to have incomes from outside work.

The governmental cost factor here is in the student remaining a student for this longer period and the maintenance of physical plant and faculty for a period which exceeds the traditional four years for each student.

Although Open Admissions has created the initial opportunity, this in itself, without enhanced understanding and sensitivity by all, may eventually bring to the minority student further frustration and despair.

STUDENT ACTIVITIES FEES

Of the many issues that contribute to campus unrest, Student Activities Fees at the State University has generated particular interest among the off-campus population.

In the Spring of 1970 some student organizations, supported by Student Activities Fees, brought to campuses speakers whose radical left ideas were not shared by many of the students or most of the general population. These appearances generated great news coverage and editorial comment.

Administrators felt that the only reason to interfere with these appearances would be an obvious threat to order on the campus. When they did not see these appearances as such a threat, they were reluctant to be involved. They took this stand based on academic freedom in the traditional view of the university. They felt that all opinions should be aired in an open intellectual arena. Additionally, these administrators at SUNY units had a directive from the University Chancellor which placed the spending of Student Activities Fees in the hands of the students, without any interference from the administrators.

While it appears that the majority of those at State University communities were in agreement with this stand, or were not at all concerned, there were those who disagreed.

Some students conducted on-campus surveys of the allocation and actual expenditure of fees. In one instance, the examination led to a law suit claiming the improper use of fees.

The Comptroller of the State of New York, who had in 1968 recommended to the Chancellor and Trustees of the University that the mandatory Student Activities Fees be expended by student

organizations without direction or directive of the administration, conducted a check of such fees in the Spring of 1970. On June 30, 1970, he published the audit which contained detailed examinations of Student Activities Fees of the State University at Albany, the State University Colleges at Buffalo, Fredonia, New Paltz, Plattsburg and Potsdam, as well as State University A and T College at Canton. As a result of this audit, the Comptroller amended his previous recommendation and suggested two alternatives. The first was to make the fees entirely voluntary, without application of college sanctions. The second was to continue to make the fees mandatory (i.e., student-assessed, with college sanctions), but at the reduced level, for specific purposes, and with intensive administrative controls.

The Comptroller's report noted that for the most part student governments had expended the activities fees in a proper and orderly manner. However, he noted that there were weak accounting procedures and budgetary allocations of a type which might logically be challenged by the administration.

At one school, he found that expenses exceeded the budget and payments were made without sufficient documentation. At another, 80 percent of an appropriation for a "Free School" was to be used to hire a professor who had already been terminated by the University.

Further, the report showed that very few students participated in Student Government elections. At one school, 943 students out of an eligible 6,500 voted in the general election of officers, for the 1970-71 Academic Year, and when the $400,000 activities

fee budget was ratified by vote, only 499 of the 6,500 voted.

In addition, it was reported to the Commission that the Student Activities Fees were expended in posting bail for students charged with offenses by off-campus authorities.

When the administrators did not interfere in the programs of left wing political speakers and Student Activities Fees' support of left wing groups, people reacted. The public viewed the administrators inaction as weakness and fear.

The position taken by these administrators, which was intended to prevent discord of the campus often led to discord.

In some instances, the better organized extremist radical elements gained control of these funds, in part due to the apathy of the moderate majority of students.

In other instances proper accounting and accountability was lacking; students' funds had disappeared into thin air.

Students who failed to pay the fees were denied their right to register to continue their educations, their diplomas and their transcripts of marks. Students who felt the fees were used for purposes with which they disagreed or that funds had wrongfully come to rest in others' pockets were not excused from payment. A system of waivers which was instituted to protect those students financially unable to pay the fee in many cases did not work well. On the campuses of the State University system, different standards and different guidelines were employed in granting waivers of fees. It appeared that students with similar reasons for waivers got them on one campus, but not on another.

Student Activities Fees

While the Fall of 1970 was a calmer time on the campuses of the State University, Student Activities Fees emerged as a paramount issue. Among students it is not so much a question of what the collected fees will be used for, but rather an objection to any recommended control over expenditures of the collected fees whether they are mandatory or voluntary.

When asked if he had more questioning of the use of the funds this year (Fall, 1970) than other years, a Treasurer of the Student Association at a State University replied,

> "Oh yes, very much so,...not necessarily whether it should be voluntary or mandatory, but who should have control of it...."

Faculty and administrators feel that Student Activities Fees support necessary cultural programs which would otherwise be unavailable to the student. They also feel that the supported interscholastic activities promote a feeling of identity and community on the campus.

The strong desire on the part of some students to have Student Activities Fees and control over how the fees are spent versus those students who are convinced that their activities fees are wasted, contributes to unrest.

The desire of the administration and some faculty to have student activities funds available for specific programs and a determination in what the programs should be raises an issue of disagreement and division on the campus.

Public knowledge of some of the abuse and misuse of Student Activities Fees for repugnant purposes has created a question of

educational accountability in the minds of the general public.

Aware of the increasing concern over this issue on October 21, 1970, the Commission adopted the following resolution calling for fully voluntary fees. It was forwarded to Chancellor and Trustees of the State University of New York for consideration in their deliberations:

RESOLUTION: October 21, 1970

WHEREAS, it is evident to this Commission that the mandatory Student Activity Fees at the units of the State University, is an irritant and underlying contributory cause to campus unrest; and,

WHEREAS, there is upwards of Five Million Dollars involved in such student activity funds; and,

WHEREAS, such funds on State operated campuses, by a 1968 ruling of the Comptroller of the State, have been governed solely by student organizations without any interference by college administrations; and,

WHEREAS, a recent study conducted by the Office of the Comptroller has caused a revision of the 1968 ruling with the recommendation for administrative controls and supervision; and,

WHEREAS, an action has been brought in the Supreme Court of the State of New York involving the inappropriate use of student activity funds; and

WHEREAS, recently the Chancellor of the State University has directed that appropriate procedures be established for review of the disbursements of such funds and a study be made of Student Activity Fee policy; and,

WHEREAS, there are reports that such directives will be challenged by student organizations and other groups; and,

WHEREAS, students, as well as the general public, are concerned with the uses of these fees and this concern is seen as a continuing and growing campus issue and cause of unrest; and,

Student Activities Fee

WHEREAS, it is reported that student funds have been diverted by methods and for purposes which may be illegal, such as the support of groups dedicated to destruction, violence and anarchy on the campuses of universities and colleges of our State;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that administrative officers shall cease to withhold grades or transcripts of credit of students solely for failure to pay Student Activity Fees; and be it,

FURTHER RESOLVED, where a voluntary Student Activity Fee has been approved by referendum, the Budget showing the unit appropriations as proposed by a Board, duly elected by the students, be submitted to a student referendum.

Since the passing of this resolution, the Trustees of the State University have adopted a plan effective in the Spring of 1971 which calls for a referendum of the students to determine whether the Student Activities Fees will be voluntary or mandatory.

However, such votes will be held only once every four years. Thus, some of the students will never have an opportunity to determine whether the fees they would have to pay would be voluntary or mandatory.

This raises the question as to whether this method will be the cause of further unrest in the State of New York.

THE FEASIBILITY AND POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS OF A PERMANENT GRIEVANCE MACHINERY FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

From our study it is evident that permanent grievance machinery must be available for all members of the academic community. The grievance procedures must be fair and thoroughly understandable.

In order to avoid unrest and tension such procedures must include due process guarantees and extend to students, faculty and other university and college personnel.

In 1969 section 6450 of the Education Law was passed requiring that colleges and universities adopt rules and regulations for the maintenance of public order on the campus. In complying, most of the institutions filed rules with the Regents and Commissioner of Education which to some degree called for grievance procedures including due process guarantees. While the formal statement appears in the rules and regulations it was often found that in actual practice these protections did not exist.

While most administrators give philosophical support to a system of grievance machinery with due process, many in their actions do not reflect it. There continues to be a reluctance on the part of some administrators to develope these procedures or to delegate power to make decisions even at the lower levels of infractions.

Students and faculty see here a defense of the traditional, arbitrary administrator, making decisions on suspension and expulsion and removal of tenure, without reference to proper evidence, procedural fairness, or mitigating circumstances.

Permanent Grievance Machinery

This is seen as an irritant and specific cause of unrest.

There was wide spread evidence of a desire for stability in the academic community. Further, there is an acknowledgement of the need for an ultimate authority.

A major cause of debate has been where this authority shall repose and what administrative form it shall take. Whatever form it takes it must be clearly responsive to the needs of all members of the community.

It is strongly suggested in matters of suspension and expulsion or firing, that the person judged be allowed the full benefits of counsel and accompanying procedural protection.

It is cautioned that these hearings should not be formalized or too legalistic and should be confined to determination of violations of rules of the college community. When criminal acts occur, whether on or off the campus, it is the consensus that their disposition be handled by civil authorities.

The implementation of permanent grievance machinery with due process guarantees for all members of the academic community is a crucial issue on campuses and needs concerted and immediate development as well as continued study and surveillance.

PART II

SECTION III

RECOMMENDATIONS

(HIGHER EDUCATION)

Recommendations to the People (Higher Education)

Each year many more of our young people are entering the colleges and universities. If these institutions are to survive, they will need the continuing financial and spiritual support of the people of the State. With this in mind, we recommend:

1) That all, whether parents of students or not, become actively interested in the colleges and universities. That they seek to learn of the contributions that these institutions make to our world.

2) That the people examine carefully the information available about the mission and facilities of the college and universities, especially those in their own areas, in an effort to join with them in making the institutions a local resource of community betterment.

3) That they find out not only what is happening on the campuses but why it is happening. That the people withhold judgments until they have learned the why of events.

Recommendations to College and University Trustees and Administrators

It is recognized that many colleges and universities have diligently moved forward reflecting the recommendations of the Commission. However, others have not. It is recommended:

1) That the colleges and universities, dependent on the financial and spiritual support of the greater society, make even greater efforts to inform and explain their missions and activities to the public to re-establish accountability and restore public confidence.
2) To promote greater communication, that trustees and especially administrators become more visible and accessible to the students.
3) That they join with the faculties to develop new methods of evaluating and rewarding faculty, other than only the institutionalized system of publication and research.
4) That consideration be given to longer periods of probation and evaluation before the granting of tenure.
5) That clear and accessible systems of grievance resolution be instituted without delay.
6) That in all proceedings there be effective due process guarantees to all members of the community.
7) That greater efforts be made to include faculty and students in meaningful participation in governance.

8) That programs be developed to promote a sense of community among all on the campus.

9) That the contributions of ethnic groups to our society be integrated into the curriculum where absent.

10) That payment of student activity fees be voluntary and in any event there should be an annual referendum of students, if students are to determine whether the fees are to be mandatory.

11) That trustees and administrators conduct a review of their rules and regulations for the maintenance of public order on campuses and other property used for educational purposes to remove the weaknesses and strengthen them to accomplish their intended purposes.

Recommendations to College and University Faculty

While many faculties have made beneficial reforms since the Commission's first report, other faculties have not. It is recommended:

1) That faculties join with administrators and trustees in developing methods of evaluating and rewarding faculty, other than only the institutionalized system of publication and research.
2) That faculty spend greater amounts of time in the classroom and in teaching rather than in research and in publishing.
3) That faculty make greater efforts to be available to students at times other than classroom presentations.
4) That where students are not included on curriculum development committees they be included.
5) That the faculty cooperate in programs designed to develop a sense of community on the campus.
6) That efforts be inaugurated and implemented where present, to revise curriculum to meet the needs of today's students and tomorrow's world.

Recommendations to the Students: (Higher Education)

It is for the students that our colleges and universities exist. If the institutions are to continue and the students obtain the available benefits, the students must assume a responsibility. To them we recommend:

1.) That they reject violence and disruptions as a means and/or method of achieving change.

2.) That they accept the basic educational system and work through legitimate means for change.

3.) That they develop a tolerance and understanding of the efforts being made on their behalf by those who are not students.

4.) That in exercising their rights and freedoms they respect the rights and freedoms of others.

5.) That they express themselves in campus decision-making through greater participation in the student referendum.

6.) That the quality of the world environment will determine the quality of their life and therefore we recommend that the students continue and intensify their efforts in eliminating the pollution in our environment.

Recommendations to the Board of Regents (Higher Education)

The Board of Regents has extensive power and oversight of the broad spectrum of education in our State. To it the Commission recommends:

1.) That the Regents make full use of its authority and power in making our system of higher education relevant to today's needs and tomorrow's world.

2.) That the method of awarding Regents Scholarships be examined to determine the feasibility of extending the period that a scholarship winner has to start his studies; so that a winner does not have to forfeit should he choose not to enroll in a post-secondary school in the September immediately following high school graduation.

3.) That Regents Scholarships be made available to students entering any certified post-secondary school or community college.

4.) That those students preparing to be elementary and secondary school teachers be required to undergo a period of teaching internship, or its equivalent, of not less than three years, all as an integral part of teacher certification requirements in New York State.

5.) That the prescribed curriculum for prospective teachers leading to teacher certification be examined and made relevant to the needs of today's students.

Recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature

The colleges and universities of our State appear to be taking positive steps in the handling of unrest and disruption. The Commission recommends no additional legislation in this area at this time.

The Commission makes recommendations in the related areas as follows:

1.) That there be established a New York State Commission on the goals of our society which would consider the effects of the development of the technonuclear age upon our daily life, our values and standards.

2.) That there be implementation of the programs endeavoring to determine the physical and psychological effects of marijuana.

3.) That the penalties for possession by users and use of marijuana be lessened.

4.) That the additional procedures needed to lower the voting age to eighteen be taken.

5.) That there be changes made in laws affecting legal maturity to correspond with lowering the voting age to eighteen.

Recommendations to the Governor and Legislature

6.) To make education more accessible to more people and lessen the resistance of the taxpayers, that attention be given to the entire scholarship and scholar incentive programs and the student loan program to provide:

a) that Regents scholarships be available to students attending other than four-year degree-granting institutions;

b) that the minimum scholar incentive of $100.00 be eliminated for those in higher income brackets;

c) that the student loan program be expanded and available for those who will benefit by and assume the responsibility for their own education.

7.) Extend the Commission to serve as a Conservator in constant surveillance of the progress being made, by those responsible at all levels of education, in eliminating the causes of unrest.

8.) Extend the Commission to continue its inquiry in and scrutiny of the following areas:

a.) The effects of the Open Admissions policies;

Recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature

b.) The formulation and implementation of effective grievance procedures for all members of the academic community;

c.) The response of the universities and colleges to the recommendations of the Commission;

d.) The impact of as well as the procedures and methods of achieving the further development of special schools for the culturally deprived;

e.) Supervision and study of the strengthening of the remedial programs at the elementary and secondary school levels;

f.) The effectiveness of the use of public funds in education in eliminating unrest;

g.) The amendments needed in the regulations, rules and statutes in order to establish in our colleges and universities a greater relevance to today's requirements.

PART III

COMMISSION MEMBERS' COMMENTS

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF HONORABLE EDWARD F. CARPENTER

MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION

This observer was impressed with the similarities between student grievances directed against colleges, universities and high schools in New York State. The high school students were critical of curriculum that they felt bore little or tangental relations to our contemporary society. This statement in no way suggests their desire to abolish every subject presently offered.

They did feel, however, that courses should be multi-faceted, encompassing skills, knowledges and techniques that will prepare them for living in a pluralistic technological world. To this end they seemed to redefine the purpose of the learning process in the high school. Their concept is that the high school should also serve as a catalystic agent for social change. So many of the students interviewed expressed dissatisfaction with the cold sterile atmosphere within the school walls.

There were expressions of frustration and some anger in what they described as the "professional and academic distance between student and teacher." This is the Delaney Card syndrome, where students are identified by rows and columns. Of course, large class enrollments may necessitate such an arrangement. However, this situation is dehumanizing and leads to estrangement and lack of identification of the student with the teacher as a humane model.

I believe that the purpose of education is to contribute to an ever advancing civilization. Subject matter should identify social pathologies that exist within political, social, civic and education institutions. Racial, religious and cultural

prejudices must be examined in the classrooms, and solutions for healing an ailing world discovered.

Since the output of educational systems are thinking humans, humanness in all of its ramifications must necessarily be an integral aspect within the teaching-learning situation. Such a transformation may be enhanced by the teacher's attitude of respect for the individual student; sensitivity to the student's goals and objectives, and the teacher's desire to prepare his charges for living in a world-wide community. Students can function as decision makers. The student must, of course, be sufficiently just to reciprocate. We must understand the theory of individual differences, but with this diversity we must achieve unity.

In brief, the school must provide the student with the opportunity of disagreeing without being disagreeable.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF SENATOR ALBERT B. LEWIS,

MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION

"There is no question that youthful attacks on our society and campus unrest will diminish if the nation's priorities can be reordered; if essentially our economy can be regeared to that of a peacetime economy. This means that the war in Viet Nam be brought to an end as soon as possible. Furthermore, in addition a national commitment to eradicate the problems of poverty, urban disintegration, environmental pollution and institutional racism will more nearly satisfy many youthful ideologies." -- The Academy in Turmoil - Report of the Temporary Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest. -- February 1, 1970.

These causes of unrest on the college campuses as reported in our Committee's report of last year, have greater impact in the high school than in the colleges.

The ghetto high school student is a product of urban blight, the drug culture, inadequate housing, broken families, economic deprivation, crime, and racism; these students do not need a course on urban blight or racism. Their contacts with the problem as distinctly different from the college student are not indirect; are not a sympathetic concern. The ghetto high school student lives within the ghetto and its multiplicity of problems; its impact upon him makes his attitudes more extreme and more hostile. The ills of the cities and the problems of the people ensnared within the ghettos of the cities are vented within the walls of the high schools.

If these problems were not enough, the ghetto high school students further suffer from educational deficiencies which cause them to be 2 to 3 years behind in reading and math. The ghetto schools are failing to teach their students between the second and eighth grades. The New York City Board of Education's recent publication of reading scores show these failures.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROBLEM

Therefore, the ghetto student carries with him from the elementary and junior high school the unrest of the ghetto, and the unrest inherent in being two to three years behind in reading and math. High School is looked upon as another learning institution which will fail him. His attitude is one of futility, boredom, discouragement and hostility.

The problems of the ghetto which affect the child's ability to be educated, cannot be solved solely by a school system. They require an overall effort of Federal, State and City Government. However, better educating the ghetto child can be achieved and better results obtained, if changes are instituted in our educational system.

Unless the student in the 2nd year to the 8th year of the school system can be properly educated then the unrest in the high school will continue and grow as these education deficit students enter the high school.

Statement of Senator Albert B. Lewis

The input necessary to correct these problems are needed immediately. This committee suggested that a new approach in the training of teachers and a greater manpower input to decrease the ratio of student to teacher in the elementary school should be implemented. Both of these approaches can be had with a minimum of expense. Therefore, we recommend that the curriculum to obtain teacher certification should be changed to require the prospective teacher to work in the 2nd and 8th year of the elementary school from their sophomore to senior year, and not in their last semester. This requirement would give the non-achieving student between the 2nd and 8th year the opportunity to be tutored or taught in a one to one basis in reading or math by the prospective teacher and it would give the best opportunity for learning the problems and methods of teaching to the prospective teacher. The cost factor would be nil. The exact rules and regulations may be set by the Board of Regents as they see fit.

The Board of Examiners has been chargeable with the selection of teachers and supervisors. The failures in the system cannot be placed at their feet alone, however; they are no longer an effective criterion to the selection of personnel. They are a vestigial bureaucracy whose actions are often unexplainable and whose expenditures could be used for more important programs. A reexamination of criteria should be commenced by the Regents and their recommendations adopted.

NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

Title I

In the ghetto schools, Title I Federal Funding is supposed to

add additional funds and personnel to correct the educational problems of the ghetto child with varied success.

Despite the expressed policy that Federal funds follow the child from his poverty target area, to any school he may attend, in New York City the practice is not being followed. The ghetto student in North Brooklyn, who attends the predominantly white South Brooklyn High School, is not provided with the additional services he would be entitled to had he remained at his North Brooklyn school. Thus, in South Brooklyn, we have the ghetto child traveling 2-1/2 to 3 hours per day, to a racially hostile environment; his educational deficiencies unresolved and without the additional personnel or programs. These childrens' identification with the school is nil and their ability to be part of any extra curricular activity limited.

These problems of ghetto high school students are compounded and exacerbated not merely by the problems of travel, the hostility of white neighborhood but by the lack of needed additional compensatory education.

SEPARATE BUT UNEQUAL

The Board of Education screens the better and achieving black student to special schools, such as John Dewey, Brooklyn Technical High School, Bronx High School of Science, Stuyvesant High School, etc. The remaining students present a more concentrated educational problem. Instead of this concentrated group of students receiving more services, the converse is true. The Board of Education effectuates a separate, but unequal, school

system by providing additi al personnel and educational assistance to the black students sent to the special schools. These services consist of summer schools, compensatory assistance, psychological, sociological and guidance personnel, reading assistance programs, etc. This additional help to these achieving students is not wrong. However, to give it to one group of students and not to another, is manifestly unfair. It is in effect a "write-off" of a large group of ghetto students who are sent to the standard high schools around the borough.

The problem of these ghetto children when placed in South Brooklyn High Schools has a detrimental effect on the ability to assist the South Brooklyn child since they have not the necessary reading teachers and remedial courses available to them.

NON-GHETTO SCHOOL STUDENT

The problem of the lack of additional services in the South Brooklyn High Schools is detrimental to the ghetto children who are sent there. They become truant, non-achieving and turned-off to the learning process. They are failing to achieve. They are failing in a larger percentage than their parents or prior generations. The student is bored and disinterested in the curriculum. In the academic high school unrest of this kind is greater than in the vocational high schools.

The problem is complex and it may have its roots in several causes:

The earlier physical maturity of the present generation as compared to their predecessor.

Statement of Senator Albert B. Lewis

The Vietnam war and the Draft.

The pressures of their society and culture for a college education and the low regard for vocational training.

The general permissive attitudes of our society.

The failure of parental involvement in their teenager caused by broken homes, by both parents working or by their failure to assume their responsibility.

An open enrollment plan guaranteeing a place in a City college.

Drug culture.

TEACHER ABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The tenure of incompetents is not a myth. It exists and continues. The teachers, the principals, the students, and parents are keenly aware of its existence. Too little has been done.

Tenure is a must to attract and keep competent teachers, however, a program of review and accountability must be instituted to cull out the incompetents and retrain or remove them.

One method by which an incompetent teacher is granted tenure is the difficult routine and hearings that a principal is forced to endure should he decide to refuse tenure. This procedures must be streamlined to permit the teacher a fair hearing and to permit a principal to act without placing himself on trial.

CURRICULUM

At John Dewey High School an experimental plan is in operation. It uses computerized scheduling and programming. It uses shorter

terms (7 week module), more mobile programming, greater course selection and a longer school day. This school receives a greater input from the Board of Education. It is the show place for visiting dignitaries and obtains larger funding and personnel allotment than other high schools. These ideas and innovations are worth implementation in the other high schools.

New York City as a cultural center has more on the site places for students to learn than any high school. The use of these cultural centers should be made part of the curriculum.

OVERCROWDING - THE INEFFICIENT STUMBLING - GOLIATH

The problem of the high school student when placed into the caldron of the overcrowded high schools in the City of New York (and other large urban areas) promotes a fertile area for disruption and chaos. These schools become susceptible to riot and violence by small minorities so motivated and activated.

High Schools built for 2500 students are used by well over 5200. Their corridors become public thoroughfares where a fight or altercation can cause a chain reaction bringing the school to a complete standstill. Cafeterias and Assemblies become holding areas of 600+ students where racial tension can and has caused much conflagration. The large student enrollment requires several sessions and large groups of students move in and out. It permits outsiders to enter. It facilitates absence from classes, narcotic sales, assaults and extortion and with little opportunity for prevention by the school. The tremendous number of students, teachers, and the staggering of sessions cause all to lose their identity and negates any school spirit or pride.

In addition, by union contract the teachers are relieved from many hall and staircase assignments. Their presence in the control of the public areas would lend more prestige to the control of order.

The Board of Education's 4-4-4 Program, further constitutes the overcrowding by increasing the population of the 3-year high school to four years. The overcrowding has many ripples not readily visible. It makes the programming a Herculean task which also involves the problems of the logistics of moving teachers and students from 4th to 1st floor within the 5 minutes provided.

It has a similar affect on the distribution of books, the feeding, cleaning and policing of the school.

The overcrowded schools permit large groups of outsiders and cutting students to roam about the school or to loiter in areaway, cafeterias, staircase landing, wash rooms, without any hindrance by the overwhelmed authorities.

The problem of following up on truancy and cutting is an immense undertaking in which the dean and attendance officer are so overloaded that they have no opportunity to notify parent rapidly or to discipline the student.

The problems of suspension become very real and insurmountable in these examples:

1. Student arrested in school with attache case containing loaded pistol, 25 heroin decks, 3 pounds of hashish. Student returns to school after arraignment.
2. 12 year old student is being extorted by a gang of four or five girls, 17 to 19 years old, at $.25 per week. One week she doesn't pay - she is undressed in the girls' bathroom, her clothes stuffed in the toilet and she is beaten.

Principal cannot get 12 year old to testify or her parents' cooperation in having her testify. She had been threatened and is in fear of her life.

3. Student strikes teacher. The teacher prefers charges for Board suspension. The student's father is called to the school on the day of the assault. The Board's suspension notice is sent four days instead of five days before the suspension hearing. The suspension is dismissed. The student had been suspended for five days by the principal on two other occasions. The student is returned to school, no penalty to await a hearing on the criminal charges. The student's lawyer has issued a cross-complaint against the teacher.

Discipline in the high school is a necessary pre-requisite for its functioning. The more crowded the facilities, the more hostile and disenchanted students the greater the need for discipline to keep the schools functioning.

Discipline is requisite not merely for the student, but for the teacher and the administration. The use of undisciplined approaches to school problems or problem students by Administration and Security Officers have triggered more serious disturbances.

In the high school today, the principal is in loco parenti with the student, as such he is chargeable with safety of the student while in his school. It therefore becomes a principal's responsibility to remove a student from the school who is destructive to his fellow students. At present, five days is the limit that the

principal can suspend without a formal Board suspension. If the student has been suspended for five days on two prior occasions, then he cannot be further suspended except in a formal Board suspension.

The formal Board suspension is an adversary proceeding in which direct testimony, confrontation, and cross-examination are procedural constitutional requisites. These procedural requirements prevent expeditious suspension, prolong proceedings, involve lost teacher time, and in some cases frighten teachers and complaintants from being involved.

This procedure may be excellent from a Constitutional safeguard; however, it inhibits the principal's authority and adds to the breakdown of discipline.

The suspension rights of the principals must be enforced to deal with disruptive students expeditiously. The principal should have the right to recommend a 20-day suspension. This right may be reviewable by a review board and their recommendations in each case would control. If these alternatives are given the suspended student, then the due process safeguards of confrontation, cross-examination may be relaxed in the hearing review of his suspension. Hearsay evidence should also be considered.

The suspension of a student should not be the placing of an unruly student into an educational limbo. The suspended student should be provided with real educational alternatives. These alternatives must be presented and made available by recommendations of the Board of Regents.

LETTER FROM THE HONORABLE CARL H. PFORZHEIMER, JR.

MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION

Carl H. Pforzheimer & Company
70 Pine Street
New York, New York 10005

April 28, 1971

The Hon. Charles D. Henderson
Chairman
The Temporary State Commission to Study
the Causes of Campus Unrest
Member, New York State Assembly
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

Dear Charlie:

The great satisfaction and inspiration accruing to me from service on the Commission was derived in fair measure from the discussion, writing and editing phases of the work of the Commission, especially as the first Report deadline came due last year. It has therefore been most distressing that my recent illness and far longer-than-anticipated convalescence have precluded active participation in these same phases of the second Report due day after tomorrow.

However briefly because of medical reasons, having been given the opportunity of going through the high spots of the almost final draft during three marathon telephone conversations last night and today, it is satisfying to note that most points significant to me as important causes of unrest are in the body or in the recommendations of the second Report. These have included references to improving communications between elements within the schools, as well as between the schools and their several constituencies; improvement of curriculum in the light of present and foreseeable needs of our society, and the methods of delivering this curriculum; administrative rigidities and recurring drabness in so many school systems and facilities; teacher training and performance; and meaningful accountability of the whole educational community, both lay and professional.

Most satisfying are recommendations that there must be provision within educational facilities, public or private, for chronically disaffected and disruptive students (regardless of what are the causes) just as is now provided for the physically and mentally handicapped.

There are still a few places in the Report itself and in the recommendations where language used gives emphasis other than my own preference. However, you have assured me that you will receive any further comments, other than those covered in the telephone conversations, if submitted before the Commission expires on May 31 of this year.

Again, I regret exceedingly that it was impossible for me to take a more active part in the final deliberations with you and other members of the Commission and with the staff. Many thanks to all of you for your forbearance and cooperation, and especially for your volunteering to include this letter in the Report.

Warmest regards to you, and through you to our colleagues and to our staff.

Most sincerely,

/s/ Carl

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.

CHP:bh

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF ASSEMBLYMAN ALVIN M. SUCHIN

MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION

The phenomenon of unrest on our college campuses, which has erupted on our national scene in recent years, has even more recently spread to the secondary and tertiary schools, much to the amazement and concern of the over-thirty generation.

It has long been an acceptable tradition for the college generation to express itself, seriously and otherwise, in a demonstrative manner in support of or in protest to certain causes, although perhaps more enthusiastically than deemed appropriate to their elders. Consequently, the new rash of college protests and demonstrations, while more colorful and militant than in the past, are nevertheless understandable in the light of long-standing practices.

However, high school and grammar school unrest and protests are a brand-new sight to behold. What are the reasons for and the causes of this modern innovation? What features of the 1970's have precipitated this unusual development?

Certainly, many of the factors involved in the area of college unrest are present on the high school level - greater sophistication on the part of young people, more affluence and time available to them for free expression, greater mobility and more rapid means of transportation and communication with one another, the increased usage of narcotics, disillusion with the solutions presented by their elders, the ever-hovering specter of new, horrible weapons of warfare, the emphasis on the dramatic

by our television screens, and the deteriorating state of morality and mores in our society since the assassination of President Kennedy. However, high school unrest is even more complex and involved than that on the primary school level.

No report, no matter how comprehensive and detailed, could possibly explore to the nth degree each and every factor involved, and arrive at easy, pat solutions. In fact, unrest, whether it be of the college or high school type, may not be totally evil; some of it may well be considered healthy and to be encouraged in stimulating a greater society for our young people for their elders, and for the generations to come.

At any rate, it is obvious that unrest, whether we like it or not, will be present with us for a long time to come. Let us hope that as it attaches to our scene, it will not involve violence, senseless slaughter, or poisonous attitudes. Let us also trust that the dissatisfaction expressed by our young people will be offered to the public in a persuasive, convincing, and civilized fashion.

In return, those of us in the over-thirty generation should listen to the voices of our young people, even those in our grammar schools. No longer should it be fashionable to follow the rule that "children should be seen but not heard."

While we must hearken to what they have to say, we should take steps to adopt some of the much needed changes they are seeking - not necessarily every thing, but revisions that are truly fair and equitable in the light of current circumstances.

For example, we have in the past placed such an undue amount of emphasis on the need for the hard and fixed four year college education, and to the very lucky ones, graduate school degrees. But a college education or degree should not be the criterion for gaining a sound preparation for a field of occupation. We must de-emphasize the great and glorious illusions of a college education. We must attempt at the high school level to channel the talents of students - and all of them are gifted in some manner - in the appropriate direction for which their talents are bent. Some may not be comfortable with an intensive instruction in a language course or in mathematics or in the arts - they may find it wasteful to be required to spend time in such pursuits. For them perhaps a business or vocational training, in a more practical field of endeavor, would be far more desirable, relevent, and productive for them. Consequently, we need to develop a degree of prestige for vocational instruction and training equal to that which is attached to our college education. And we should at the same time make it easier for students to choose the course or curriculum which better fits their needs.

As stated earlier, the report of our Commission does not contain all of the answers to the current phenomenon of campus unrest. Let us trust that it does provide some assistance to the citizenry of our State in understanding the problem, in coping with it, and in turning it into a force for developing a better society for us and our fellow man.

APPENDIX TO PART I

APPENDIX A

TEMPORARY STATE COMMISSION
TO STUDY THE CAUSES OF CAMPUS UNREST

Charles D. Henderson, Chairman

Preliminary

STATUS SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL UNREST

For the Academic Years

1968-69 and 1969-70

August, 1970

GENERAL DATA FOR ADMINISTRATORS

I. NAME OF INSTITUTION _____

II. LOCATION (city, county) _____

III. TYPE (check one only)

1. _____ Public
2. _____ Private (non-parochial)
3. _____ Parochial

IV. LOCATION (check one)

1. _____ Urban over 100,000 population
2. _____ Urban less than 100,000 population
3. _____ Suburban
4. _____ Rural

V. ENROLLMENT (please give numbers)

1. _____ Male
2. _____ Female
3. _____ Total

VI. ETHNIC COMPOSITION (please give proportion of student body)

1. _____ White
2. _____ Black
3. _____ Oriental
4. _____ Puerto Rican
5. _____ American Indian
6. _____ Other (please specify)

VII. OTHER DATA

1. Percent of seniors from last graduating class who are planning to attend college _____.

2. Percent of seniors from last graduating class who are planning on advanced training of a non-collegiate nature _____.

3. Faculty - student ratio _____.

GENERAL DATA FOR STUDENTS

I. TYPE (check one only)

1. _____ Public
2. _____ Private (non-parochial)
3. _____ Parochial

II. LOCATION (check one)

1. _____ Urban over 100,000 population
2. _____ Urban less than 100,000 population
3. _____ Suburban
4. _____ Rural

III. ENROLLMENT (please give numbers)

1. _____ Male
2. _____ Female
3. _____ Total

NAME OF INSTITUTION_____

1. Was there any activity at your institution in the past two academic years which could be termed student unrest?

   Check those which are applicable

   _____ Yes (9/68 - 6/69)
   _____ Yes (9/69 - 4/70)
   _____ Yes (only after 4/30/70)
   _____ No (if no, turn to question 15)

2. For each of the time periods given below, please indicate the approximate number of occurrences of unrest by the types as listed below that are most applicable to your situation.

   Type A Intellectual Ferment

   Type B Demonstrations (picketing, rallies, teach-ins, liberation classes, sit-ins, boycotts, memorial services, etc.)

   Type C Direct Confrontations (forceful occupation of buildings, forceful disruption of classes and other academic proceedings)

   Type D Indirect Confrontations (fire bombings, deliberate vandalism, deliberate large scale destruction of property, etc.)

   Type E "Zapism" (beer busts, indiscriminate vandalism, fistfights, rowdiness, etc.)

   Type F Other (specify)

	9/68 - 6/69	9/69 - 4/70	after 4/30/70 only
Type A			
Type B			
Type C			
Type D			
Type E			
Type F			

Please fill in the boxes with the appropriate number of occurrences of each type.

3. In your estimation, how serious was the worst case of unrest during each of the given time periods.

	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
A. Healthy Dissent			
B. Somehwat harmful but not critical to the normal functioning of the institution			
C. Critical disruption of institutional functions with mainly positive impacts			
D. Critical disruption of institutional functions with mainly negative impacts			
E. General rowdiness and adolescent misbehavior			
F. Other (specify)			

4. For each of the given time periods, please indicate the number of days the worst incident of unrest lasted.

	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
Number of days			

5. For each of the given time periods, please indicate the proportion of the student body that was actively involved in the most serious case of unrest.

	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
Proportion			

6. If any class days were lost as a result of unrest, please indicate the number of days lost with resulting positive impacts, for each of the given time periods.

	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
Class days lost (positive)			

7. If any class days were lost as a result of unrest, please indicate the number of days lost which resulted in either negative impacts or simply wasted days, for each of the given time periods.

	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
Class days lost (negative or wasted)			

8. List, in order of importance, the major issues, which in your judgement, apparently precipitated unrest at your institution. Also, please indicate by the appropriate time period(s) to which each is applicable.

Issues	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			

9. For each of the given time periods, check all of the issues which you feel were underlying the student unrest in your school.

ISSUES	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
A. Personal Conduct Issues			
1. Dress Codes			
2. Rules of personal appearance			
3. Smoking rules			
4. Use of drugs			
5. Drinking rules			
6. Attendance rules			
7. Freedom of expression			
8. Freedom of association			
9. Use of school services and facilities			
10. Quality of school services and facilities			
11. Student participation in decision-making			
12. Excessive discipline and control			
13. Lack of due process			
14. Other (specify)			
B. Academic Concerns			
1. Curriculum content			
2. Types of teaching			
3. Modes of scheduling			
4. Faculty tenure policy			
5. Extracurricular faculty activities			
6. Freedom to teach			
7. Freedom to learn			
8. Viability of curriculum			
9. Types of extracurricular activities			
10. Content of extracurricular activities			
11. Student participation in policy-making			
12. Freedom of expression in class			
13. Freedom of expression in extracurricular activities			
14. Other (specify)			

9. (Continued)

ISSUES	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
C. Larger Social Issues			
1. Viet Nam War			
2. Cambodian conflict			
3. Draft			
4. Defense research			
5. Other aspects of U.S. military policy			
6. Economic inequality			
7. Economic opportunity			
8. Ethnic inequality			
9. Ethnic identity			
10. Apparent government attitude toward students			
11. Apparent unresponsiveness of government			
12. Apparent government policy			
13. Other (specify)			

10. Have racial or ethnic issues and problems played a major role in precipitating unrest?

_____ Yes

_____ No

If so, please indicate the specific kinds of racial or ethnic problems and issues that were involved.

A. _____ Feelings of hostility, violent confrontations, overt or covert antagonisms, etc. stemming from racial or ethnic prejudice and tensions.

B. _____ An overall desire for equality of opportunity in reality or a quest for cultural identity among racial or ethnic groups.

N.B. If you answered question #10 "no", or have answered it "yes" and checked "B" only, then answer question 11. Otherwise go on to question 12.

11. If violence to persons or substantial physical damage to property accompanied the unrest, please indicate the number of incidents which involved these for the given time periods.

Type	9/68-6/69	9/69-4/70	after 4/30/70 only
A. Physical violence to persons.			
B. Substantial physical damage to property			

12. Check all of the characteristics listed below which generally apply to the active participants in the most serious instances of unrest.

A. Class Level

1. _____ Freshman
2. _____ Sophomore
3. _____ Junior
4. _____ Senior
5. _____ Postgraduate
6. _____ Other (specify)

B. Achievement Level in Grades

1. _____ High
2. _____ Average
3. _____ Low

C. Post-graduation Goals

1. _____ 4-year college
2. _____ 2-year college
3. _____ Technical school
4. _____ Business school
5. _____ Military service
6. _____ Work
7. _____ Other (specify)

D. Ethnic Composition

1. _____ Black
2. _____ White
3. _____ Oriental
4. _____ Puerto Rican
5. _____ American Indian
6. _____ Other (specify)

13. Were any persons besides students at your school involved in the most serious instances of unrest?

_____ Yes
_____ No

If so, please indicate the kinds of persons involved.

A. _____ Students from other high schools
B. _____ High school drop-outs
C. _____ College students
D. _____ College drop-outs
E. _____ Faculty from your school
F. _____ Faculty from other high schools
G. _____ Faculty from colleges
H. _____ Parents
I. _____ Other (please specify)

14. What have been the immediate actions in response to the most serious case of unrest at your school?

A. _____ Police or other security force called in
B. _____ Temporary closing of school
C. _____ Suspension of normal activities and substitution of other activities
D. _____ Suspension or other isolation of participants
E. _____ Disciplinary action of some other nature
F. _____ Discussions or meetings to resolve grievances
G. _____ Use of faculty and other staff as mediators, monitors, etc.
H. _____ No action
I. _____ Other (specify)

15. Please list any long-range plans you may have for resolving and/or averting any further serious unrest at your school.

16. From an administrator's point of view, what are some of the major problems at your school which have led to student unrest?

17. From a student's point of view, what are some of the major problems at your school which have led to student unrest?

APPENDIX A-1

Guide to Reading Tables

1. The first number appearing in each box is the number of units (e.g., times or schools) in the category written above the column that were reported with reference to the description written to the left of the column. In Table V, by reading left to right and adding, one gets the total number of units reporting the activity described on the left (17) (48), etc. By reading top to bottom and adding, one gets the total number of units reporting from the category written above the column (39) (25), etc.

2. The second number in each box is the percentage of the total (100%) reports of that activity described at the left of the column. In Table V, by reading the second number in each box, left to right and adding, one gets the total (100%) of the activity reported (e.g., intellectual ferment).

3. The third number in each box is the percentage of the total (100%) experience of the unit (e.g., times or schools) in the category written above the column. In Table V, by reading top to bottom and adding, one gets the total (100%) of all the unrest reported by the unit described above the column (e.g., schools in urban areas with populations over 100,000), etc.

APPENDIX B

Analysis of High School Administrators' Responses to Survey and Tables

Introduction

Compared to the 212 institutions of higher education in New York State, there are roughly 2,000 institutions which offer programs at the secondary level. The only feasible way of obtaining an accurate picture of the situation at all these schools was to make use of random sampling. By this method, 100 high schools were selected which accurately represent all the high schools in the State. The chief administrative officers of these institutions were sent a questionnaire entitled, "Preliminary Status Survey of High School Unrest for the Academic Years 1968-69 and 1969-70"*. Ninety-one of the hundred schools surveyed responded.

Institutions with No Unrest

In the public realm, 25 of the 63 public schools responding experienced no unrest. Most of the private and parochial schools were free from unrest; only 3 of the 15 private schools and 2 of the parochial schools had any type of activity that could be termed unrest. None of the all-female schools had unrest. Six out of the ten all-male institutions reported no unrest and thirty-two of the seventy-one coeducational institutions did not have unrest.

---

*A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

When analyzed by the location of the school, 53% of those in urban areas with a population of more than 100,000 and 36% of the schools in suburbia were free from unrest. Administrators from schools in urban areas with populations under 100,000 had the greatest incidence of unrest, with 75% of the schools reporting some sort of activity. The rural schools were the quietest - three-fourths of them reported no unrest at all.

Enrollment size of the school also appears to be a factor in lack of unrest:

Enrollment Size	Percentage of Schools With No Unrest
0 - 200	84%
201 - 500	84%
501 - 1000	64%
1001 - 2000	30%
2001 - 3000	0%
3001 - 4000	0%
4001 - 5000	0%
More than 5000	0%

It can be seen that the larger the school, the greater the probability that unrest will occur. All schools with enrollments over 2000 reported unrest.

In summation, institutions with no unrest tended to be:

Non-Coeducational

Private

Parochial

Rural

Small

Type and Severity of Unrest

Just less than half of the responding institutions (43 or 47%) experienced student unrest in the academic years 1968-69 and 1969-70. The unrest that occurred fell into six possible categories:

Intellectual Ferment*

Demonstrations (picketing, rallies, teach-ins, liberation classes, sit-ins, boycotts, memorial services, etc.)

Direct Confrontations (forceful occupation of buildings, forceful disruption of classes and other academic proceedings)

Indirect Confrontations** (fire bombings, deliberate vandalism, deliberate large scale destruction of property, etc.)

"Zapism" (beer busts, indiscriminate vandalism, fist-fights, rowdiness, etc.)

Other (Specify)

---

*Intellectual Ferment implies a general atmosphere of dis-ease in the school marked by such things as students' remarks in class, etc. Intellectual ferment precludes any specially organized events such as teach-ins or liberation classes which are categorized as demonstrations.

**While not so indicated in the survey (See Appendix A), Indirect Confrontations are generally situations in which the people involved are unknown. This distinguishes indirect confrontations from direct confrontations in which the participants openly oppose each other - usually the students vs. the administration.

Unrest was evidenced most frequently in the form of demonstrations - 54% of all the unrest that occurred. Nineteen percent of the unrest was categorized as intellectual ferment; sixteen percent was considered Zapism. The more serious forms of unrest, direct and indirect confrontations, occurred ten percent of the time.

By exploring the characteristics of the institutions at which different types of unrest occurred, it can be determined whether these characteristics bear any relationship to the form in which unrest is manifested.

The private and parochial schools were void of any type of unrest except demonstrations and intellectual ferment. When the location of the schools is taken into account, demonstrations and intellectual ferment were not confined to any particular area. Zapism was a characteristic of the urban areas with populations of more than 100,000 and the rural areas. Except for one case, direct and indirect confrontations occurred in the largest urban areas. (See Table V) Intellectual ferment and demonstrations took place in schools of all enrollment sizes. Half of the direct confrontations occurred in schools with enrollments between 501 and 1000, the other half in schools of 4001 to 5000. Indirect confrontations occurred exclusively in the large schools with enrollments over 3000. Zapism was a characteristic of the smaller schools. (See Table VI)

Severity of Unrest

The administrations were asked to estimate the severity of the worst case of unrest. They were given a choice of six possible categories:

Healthy Dissent.

Somewhat harmful but not critical to the normal functioning of the institution.

Critical disruption of institutional functions with mainly positive impacts.*

Critical disruption of institutional functions with mainly negative impacts.**

General rowdiness and adolescent misbehavior.

Other. (Specify)

Thirty percent of the unrest that occurred was felt to be an example of healthy dissent; ten percent was considered an exhibition of general rowdiness and adolescent misbehavior. Fifty-nine percent of the instances of unrest interrupted the normal functioning of the schools in which they occurred: Forty-one percent were somewhat harmful to this functioning, while 4% were a critical disruption with positive impacts on the school and 14% were a critical disruption with negative impacts on the school.

An analysis of the characteristics of the institutions in which unrest occurred reveals that the degree of severity of the unrest bears some relationship to these characteristics. Healthy dissent and unrest that was somewhat harmful to the normal functioning of the institution were the only degrees of severity reported by the private and parochial schools.

All the critical instances of unrest were in public high schools

---

*These are events which seriously disrupted the school when they occurred, but which resulted in long-term beneficial effects.

**Critical disruptions with negative impacts can be described as events which had no beneficial effects of any kind.

The location of the high schools appeared to be indicative of the seriousness of the student unrest that took place. (See Table VII)

The urban schools in cities over 100,000 encountered student activities that were mainly injurious to the school. The administrators reported that 29% of the unrest was somewhat harmful, while 43% was considered a critical disruption of institutional functions. The administrators thought that only 9% of the student unrest comprised activities that could be considered healthy dissent.

In the urban schools in cities under 100,000, critical disruptions characterized only 10% of the unrest. The majority (45%) was somewhat harmful to the school, while 30% was healthy dissent.

In the suburban schools the majority of the unrest (72%) was exhibited in the form of healthy dissent. There was one incident which caused a critical disruption with positive impacts. According to the survey responses, no healthy dissent was evident in the rural schools. Seventy-one percent of the unrest was somewhat harmful and 21% was termed general rowdiness and adolescent misbehavior.

It is interesting to note the way administrators from different areas regarded the type of unrest occurring in their schools. In the largest urban areas intellectual ferment and demonstrations comprised 61% of the unrest, yet administrators rated 72% of the unrest harmful to or a critical disruption of the institutions.

In the smaller urban areas where 68% of the unrest was manifested in the form of demonstrations or intellectual ferment, administrators felt that 55% of the unrest was harmful or critical.

Suburban schools experienced only intellectual ferment and demonstrations (60%), yet here the administrators looked upon

72% of the unrest as healthy dissent. Fifty percent of rural unrest was demonstrations and 12.5% intellectual ferment.

Rural administrators did not consider any of the student unrest as healthy dissent.

Instances of healthy dissent predominated (62%) in schools of 1001 to 2000 enrollment. Schools of all sizes experienced unrest that was somewhat harmful. Two of the three critical disruptions with positive impacts took place in schools of 1001 to 2000; the other instance occurred in a school of 4001 to 5000. Seventy percent of the critical disruptions with negative impacts were in the large schools with enrollments over 3000. (See Table VIII)

Who Participated in the Unrest?

According to the administrators, students become more active as they progress through school. In the last two years, 9.9% of the student participants were freshmen, 13.6% were sophomores, 30.9% were juniors and 44.4% were seniors. No postgraduates engaged in unrest on the high school campuses. Administrators felt that the student activists were predominantly (77.6%) of high and average intelligence. Sixty-five percent intend to go on to two and four year colleges; 6.7% will attend technical school; 5.3% will attend business school; 5.3% will enter military service, and 16% will join the work force. According to the administrators, the majority of the student participants were white (58.1%) and twenty-nine percent were black and 9.7% were Puerto Rican. The remainder of the student participants were described as Oriental, American Indians and other.

In those schools in which 40% or less of the graduating seniors are planning college, there is a less likely occurrence of unrest.

The chances of a high school experiencing unrest are the greatest in public schools, when 81 to 100% of their graduating class are planning a college education.

There were only 3 schools which had from 16 to 25% of their graduates planning college. Of these only one school experienced unrest, with 10% of the student body involved. Of the 12 schools which had from 26 to 40% of their seniors planning to attend college, over half experienced no unrest and the largest percentage of students involved in the cases of unrest averaged 19.5%. The largest number of schools had from 41 to 60% of their students planning college. Nineteen of these schools had no unrest and fourteen did. The largest percentage of students involved in unrest in these schools never exceeded 50%. Only in those high schools which had from 61 to 80% of their seniors planning college, were there more schools with unrest than with no unrest. Fifty-nine percent of these high schools had unrest averaging 37% of the student body. These figures include private and parochial schools. In the public schools which had from 61 to 80% of their students planning college, all but three had unrest.

There were 25 schools which had from 81 to 100% of their graduating class making plans for college. Of these schools, 44% experienced unrest and only in these schools did the largest percentage of students involved in unrest reach 90% (in 2 instances). It is interesting to note that 72% of the schools reporting 81 to 100% of their seniors were planning advanced collegiate training were private or parochial. Of the 7 public schools with this percentage (81 to 100%) planning college every school had unrest, with the

proportion of the student body participating ranging from 1 to 90% and averaging 25%. In the schools which had 61 to 80% of their students planning college, the highest average of students involved in unrest is found (40%).

Outside Participants: Twenty-one of the 43 schools at which unrest was reported has persons other than their own students involved in the most serious instances of unrest. Roughly a fourth of these other persons were faculty from the same high school. No faculty from other high schools or from colleges were involved. Sixteen and seven-tenths percent of the other participants were high school drop-outs, 19% were college students, and 11.9% were parents.

Violence and Student Unrest

One of the issues foremost in the minds of many people when they think of student unrest is the accompanying violence and destruction that is so often publicized. This did not typify the unrest reported to us by the schools surveyed.

For the period September 1968 - June 1970, high school administrators reported only 6 instances of violence associated with unrest in their schools. Violence was a characteristic of unrest only in the public schools. Three of the cases were violence to persons; the remaining 3 were instances of substantial physical damage to property. Violence to persons occurred in two large urban male technical high schools with enrollments of more than 5000. The other single incident was in a coeducational rural school with 201 to 500 pupils.

Substantial physical violence to property took place only in coeducational institutions. Two of the schools involved were urban

schools, one with an enrollment between 1000 and 2000, the other with an enrollment of 4000 to 5000. Again, the third incident was in a small rural school.

According to administrative responses, violence in the high schools of New York State in the last two years, has been virtually non-existent. One limitation of this finding lies in the area of property destruction. The survey question referred only to substantial physical damage, thus leaving the administrator with a highly subjective decision to make. The question also precludes all the less serious incidents of damage to property, which cumulatively may be quite serious and expensive.

Racial and Ethnic Problems

One-fourth (11 schools) of the 43 institutions that reported they had experienced student unrest felt that racial or ethnic issues and problems played a major role in precipitating unrest. All of these schools were public and all in urban areas except one suburban school - the majority in cities with populations larger than 100,000. Six of the eleven schools had enrollments larger than 3000 while four had enrollments between 1001 to 2000.

The kinds of racial or ethnic problems that were involved were:

1. Overt Racism: This is a situation in the schools when the atmosphere is marked by feelings of hostility, violent confrontations, overt or covert antagonisms, etc., stemming from racial or ethnic prejudice and tensions. The effects of this form of prejudice were felt in 5 of the 11 schools, all confined to the largest urban areas. Three of the schools were coeducational and two were technical high schools with a totally male enrollment. By enrollment size, 3 had enrollments larger than 4000, while 2 were in the enrollment category of 1000 to 3000.

2. Quest for Equality of Opportunity and Cultural Identity: Seven of the schools reported this type of problem in which the racial or ethnic groups express an overall desire for equality of opportunity or a search for a cultural identity. The schools in which the issues played a role in precipitating unrest were all coed, all but one was an urban school, 4 had enrollments larger than 3000, and 3 had enrollments between 1000 and 2000.

According to the 91 high school administrators who responded to the questionnaire, only 11 had racial unrest in their schools. These represented public schools exclusively which were predominantly in urban settings and had large enrollments. Overt racial problems occurred only in schools in the largest cities of this State.

Of the 91 schools responding to the survey, seventy-two were racially mixed. Of the seventy-two schools, thirty-four (47.2%) reported unrest and thirty-eight (52.8%) reported no unrest. Eleven of the 34 integrated schools stated that racial issues played a precipitating role in unrest. Six of these schools had a non-white enrollment of 10 to 20%; two had a non-white enrollment of greater than 50%.

However, a third school with a 97.2% black student body had no unrest whatsoever.

Racial issues did not arise in any of the reporting schools whose student bodies were 90% or more white.

Major Issues Which Precipitated Unrest

The high school administrators responding to the questionnaire were asked to list the major issues, which in their judgment apparently precipitated unrest at their institutions. The answers to this open-ended question were classified into fourteen possible categories. It is to be noted that these categories are not placed in any rank order according to response.

1. Rules of behavior in school (dress, appearance, smoking.)
2. The deaths at Kent State and Jackson State.
3. The war in Vietnam and its expansion into Cambodia.
4. Black problems (identity, curriculum, Black Power groups.)
5. Racial relations (black, white and Puerto Rican tensions.)
6. Teacher strikes.
7. School budget.
8. Student participation in decision making and policy making.
9. Lack of freedom of expression (censorship, senior privileges, restrictions in class and academic work.)
10. Attendance regulations (schedule, overlapping sessions, attendance policy.)
11. School services.
12. Curriculum deficiencies.
13. Influence of college students and college publications.
14. Drugs.

According to the administrators, the major issues, which in their judgement precipitated unrest, could be placed in three general categories: (1) national issues; (2) Student demands for increased freedom and power; (3) racial problems. The frequency with which these issues were mentioned occurs in the same order.

National Issues: The continuing war in Southeast Asia and its expansion into Cambodia was the issue administrators most frequently cited (1/4 of all responses) as precipitating student unrest. Only in the rural schools was the war exceeded by concern over another issue -- rules of behavior in school, such as dress

and appearance codes and smoking prohibitions. Vietnam and Cambodia were also the foremost issues in schools of almost all enrollment sizes. The small schools in the enrollment categories 201 to 500 and 501 to 1000 were mainly concerned with rules of behavior. The few schools with enrollments over 5000 stressed black problems as the major issue. The other national issues which germinated student unrest were the killing of students on the Kent State and Jackson State campuses. This issue was not related to any particular school characteristics.

Racial Problems: Disquiet on the high school campuses was the outgrowth of racial relations and the discontent of minority groups on 19 separate occasions. Six of the instances were the upshot of racial tensions among black, white and/or Puerto Rican student factions. The majority of the occurrences arose from the activities of a militant (not necessarily physical) minority seeking to exercise power in determining particular rules of conduct, privileges and curriculum offerings for their own group. Except for two instances of unrest in suburban schools, problems relating to minority groups were confined to the urban high schools.

Issues of Personal and Academic Freedom: The third group of issues mentioned with great frequency were matters that affected the students' personal and academic freedom. These issues accounted for 31% or 35 of the responses. In the area of personal freedom the young people felt frustration over the rules governing their dress and appearance, over the lack of privileges (especially for seniors), and over the prohibition upon smoking. Acadamically, the students were discontented with the lack of freedom they were

allowed in expressing themselves in and out of class. They felt prohibited from expressing their views in the classroom and censored when they attempted to do so in publications. In order to obtain an education satisfactory to their desires, they wanted to have a share in the decision and policy making affecting their lives. Rules of behavior (dress, hair, smoking) was mentioned most frequently by rural schools where it was also the predominant issue, and by schools of small enrollment size. Seventy-eight percent of the responses referring to student participation in decision and policy making were from urban schools. Lack of freedom of expression was an issue cited by schools regardless of their location.

Other Issues: Student unrest was ascribed to several other precipitants. Three instances were attributed to teacher strikes, two to school budget issues, two to attendance regulations and six to the quality of school services. On three occasions administrators credited college students and their publications with instigating unrest in their schools. Only twice did curriculum appear as a major issue. One administrator from a small private boys' school in suburbia considered drug use a major cause of student unrest.

Personal Conduct Issues Relating to Enrollment, Location and Type of School*

The two major personal conduct issues reported as underlying student unrest in the high schools are closely related.

They are lack of freedom in expression and in activities, and student participation in both decision making and in the disciplinary

---

*See Appendix A, question 9A of the questionnaire

system. These two issues had their highest incidence in public, urban (more than 100,000) schools with enrollments ranging from 501 to 2000 or 4001 to 5000 students. Students from schools located in suburban areas mentioned these issues the least. Rules of dress and appearance assumed a priority in suburban and rural schools, along with issues relating to smoking, drinking, and drugs. Only 5.7% of the urban (more than 100,000) schools mentioned the issues of dress, smoking, etc., as underlying unrest.

All schools which cited attendance rules as an issue were public; 70% of them were schools with from 501 to 2000 students. The quality of school services and facilities was mentioned the most in urban schools. Almost half the schools which mentioned this as an issue had from 4001 to 5000 students.

Only once did a parochial school mention an issue underlying unrest and that was student participation in decision making.

Private, other than parochial, schools also had few instances where personal conduct issues contributed to unrest. As was mentioned, the public schools had the greatest share of such issues. There was only one mention of freedom of association as an issue. It was in a public, urban (more than 100,000) school with from 501 to 2000 students.

Academic Concerns Underlying Student Unrest*

Those surveyed schools which reported the largest percentage of academic concerns underlying unrest, have the same characteristics as those citing the greatest number of personal conduct issues underlying unrest. They are public, urban (over 100,000)

---

*See Appendix A, question 9B of the questionnaire

and have from 501 to 2000 or 4001 to 5000 students. Content and flexibility of the curriculum was a major importance in academic concerns, especially in urban schools (60%). Suburban and rural schools each made up 20% of the number of schools reporting curriculum as an issue.

Student participation in policy making was also a subject mentioned often, especially in urban (more than 100,000) schools. Freedom of expression in both class and extracurricular activities, was not mentioned as an issue in suburban or rural schools. Issues as modes of scheduling, faculty tenure policy and type and content of extracurricular activities were less frequently mentioned.

Quality of teaching as an issue was mentioned by schools of all locations.

The only academic concern reported as underlying unrest and common to the public, private and parochial schools was student participation in policy making. Almost 90% of the academic concerns were cited by the public institutions.

Larger Social Issues Underlying Student Unrest*

It appears that the students are most deeply disturbed over the war and the draft. In the rural schools, administrators reported that 66.7% of the larger social issues underlying unrest revolved around this issue. Forty-three and eight-tenths percent of the larger social issues in suburban schools were related to the war and 38.1% in each of the urban categories (population over and

---

*See Appendix A, question 9C of the questionnaire. "Larger social issues" encompass such things as Vietnam and Cambodia, the draft, defense research, military policy, economic and ethnic issues, government attitude toward students and unresponsiveness of government.

under 100,000). Following the war and the draft, administrators feel the next is ethnic identity and inequality. (This is not a subject of concern in the surveyed rural schools.)

The apparent government attitudes toward students, and the unresponsiveness and lack of credibility of the government are mentioned equal frequency, most often in urban (more than 100,000) schools. Defense research and other aspects of the United States Military is not mentioned in the rural schools while 50% of the surveyed schools in urban areas of over 100,000 listed this as an issue underlying unrest.

The greatest number of all the schools reporting Vietnam, Cambodia and the draft as an issue have student enrollments of from 501 to 2,000 students and 92.3% of them are public.

None of the parochial schools mention larger social issues underlying student unrest. Of those issues the private schools mention, the apparent government attitude and unresponsiveness are the most frequently cited. Students enrolled in urban schools are much more likely to be involved in larger social issues than are students from schools from suburban or rural locations. Also, students from urban schools focus less of their attention on Vietnam, Cambodia and the draft (as is more the case in rural schools) but they feel ethnic identity and inequality and governmental attitudes warrant almost equal attention.

Immediate Actions in Response to the Most Serious Instance of Unrest

High school administrators reported a variety of actions that were taken immediately in response to the most serious case of unrest. Roughly half of the actions were of a forceful nature

and the other half assumed the character of mediation and resolution. Forty-seven percent of the actions taken involved discussions or meetings to resolve grievances and the use of faculty and other staff members as mediators and monitors.

Of the resultant actions, 22% directly affected the student participants, by calling for their suspension or isolation, or involving disciplinary action of some other nature. At eight high schools, it was necessary to call in the police or the security force. Eight schools were temporarily closed after the most serious case of unrest. The suspension of normal activities and the substitution of other activities took place at seven high schools.

Occurrence, Type and Duration of Unrest in Relation to Faculty-Student Ratios

The largest bulk of high school unrest occurred in schools in which there was one faculty member for each 10 to 20 students. In those schools which had more than 21 students per teacher, less than half experienced unrest. In the 10 schools which had 9 students or less for every teacher there was only one instance of unrest. In those schools with faculty-student ratios of one teacher for each 10 to 18 students, half experienced unrest. The schools with a faculty member for every 18 to 20 students accounted for 34.1% of all of the unrest -- 65.2% of these schools experienced unrest. The longest duration of the unrest in schools with 20 students or less per teacher is approximately 2 days. Also, in these schools, intellectual ferment and demonstrations accounted for most of the unrest. There were 2 instances of direct confrontation and one of indirect confrontation in schools with one faculty member for every 18 to 20 students.

There were 5 schools which had a teacher for every 21 to 23 pupils and of these only one had unrest, but it lasted 25 days. There were six schools with faculty-student ratios of 1:23 to 25, 4 of which had unrest. Two of the five schools with 26 to 30 students for each teacher experienced unrest, which took the form of intellectual ferment, demonstrations, indirect confrontations and "Zapism."

Administrators' Long Range Plans for Resolving or Averting Unrest

Administrators from schools that did have unrest and also from schools that have not as yet experienced any turmoil listed the plans they have for the future. All but seven of the 91 principals responding to the questionnaire had formulated such plans and many were already beginning to implement them. There were 187 responses listed and all but four involved changes that would alter some aspect of the school system. The four that did not were administrators who planned to avoid unrest with discipline and a rigid enforcement of the school rules.

The changes suggested affected the school administration, teaching and curriculum, school regulations, and in all instances the role and dignity of the students at that school. The most frequently mentioned plans involved an opening up of communications and interactions that would affect the atmosphere of the school and the events taking place in it. Sixty-six administrators resolved to effect increased communications and interaction among students, faculty, administrators, parents, and the community, so that all parties would have a better understanding of the needs, desires and opinions of each other and any actions taken would be on this more rational basis.

In 46 schools, the administrators proposed to allot their students a proper share in the policy and decision making processes of the school. In this area of increased student involvement and freedom, 11 administrators were inclined to minimize the number of rules and requirements affecting the students. Such things were mentioned as the abolishing of the dress code and the pass system, which limits the students' freedom of movement and is a sore point in many schools. Again in the area of freedoms, nine administrators intend to increase the students' freedom of expression in the classroom, in their school papers, in their clubs, and in other such areas.

To alleviate unrest in another way, eleven administrators are designing workshops, teach-ins, and class discussions in which vital issues can be discussed and assume a place in the school rather than being ignored.

Plans to improve teaching and curriculum were presented by 36 administrators. Six of them intend to implement a Black Studies program; eighteen plan to improve curriculum and instruction more generally by expanding and altering it to meet the needs of all interests and all intellectual levels.

One administrator is trying to make college courses available to those students who are interested and capable.

Twelve administrators proposed a plan to implement the selection and training of both teachers and administrators who would like and could relate to students.

Five administrators plan to give students a greater voice and role in disciplinary proceeding.

TABLE V

TYPE OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL LOCATION

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

Type of Unrest	Location: Urban More than 100,000	Urban Less than 100,000	Suburban	Rural	TOTAL
Intellectual Ferment	7 41.2% 17.9%	3 17.6% 12.0%	5 29.4% 33.3%	2 11.8% 12.5%	17 100%
Demonstrations	17 35.4% 43.6%	14 29.2% 56.0%	9 8.7% 60.0%	8 16.7% 50.0%	48 100%
Direct Confrontations	3 33.3% 7.7%			1 66.7% 6.2%	4 100%
Indirect Confrontations	5 100.0% 12.8%				5 100%
"Zapism"	7 50.0% 17.9%	2 14.3% 8.0%		5 35.7% 31.2%	14 100%
Other		6 85.7% 24.0%	1 14.3% 6.7%		7 100%
TOTAL	39 100%	25 100%	15 100%	16 100%	95 100%

TABLE VI

TYPE OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SIZE

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

Type of Unrest	School Enrollment Size: 0 - 200	201 - 500	501 - 1,000	1,001 - 2,000	2,001 - 3,000	3,001 - 4,000	4,001 - 5,000	More than 5,000	TOTAL
Intellectual Ferment	1 5.9% 25.0%	1 5.9% 20.0%	5 29.4% 26.3%	5 29.4% 15.6%			5 29.4% 26.3%		17 100%
Demonstrations	3 6.2% 75.0%	1 2.1% 20.0%	9 18.8% 47.4%	18 37.5% 56.3%	1 2.1% 33.3%	5 10.4% 55.6%	9 18.8% 47.4%	2 4.2% 33.3%	48 100%
Direct Confrontations			3 50.0% 15.8%				3 50.0% 15.8%		6 100%
Indirect Confrontations						1 20.0% 11.1%	2 40.0% 10.5%	2 40.0% 33.3%	5 100%
"Zapism"		3 21.4% 60.0%	2 14.3% 10.5%	4 28.6% 12.5%		3 21.4% 33.3%		2 14.3% 33.3%	14 100%
Other				5 71.4% 15.6%	2 28.6% 66.7%				7 100%
TOTAL	4 100%	5 100%	19 100%	32 100%	3 100%	9 100%	19 100%	6 100%	97 100%

TABLE VII

SEVERITY OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL LOCATION

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

School Location

Severity of Unrest	Urban More than 100,000	Urban Less than 100,000	Suburban	Rural	TOTAL
Healthy Dissent	2 9.5% 9.5%	6 28.6% 30.0%	13 61.9% 72.2%		21 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical	6 20.7% 28.6%	9 31.0% 45.0%	4 13.8% 22.2%	10 34.5% 71.4%	29 100%
Critical disruption w/ positive impacts	1 33.3% 4.8%	1 33.3% 5.0%	1 33.3% 5.6%		3 100%
Critical disruption w/ negative impacts	8 80.0% 38.1%	1 10.0% 5.0%		1 10.0% 7.1%	10 100%
General rowdiness & adolescent behavior	4 57.1% 19.0%			3 42.9% 21.4%	7 100%
Other		3 100.0% 15.0%			3 100%
TOTAL	21 100%	20 100%	18 100%	14 100%	73 100%

TABLE VIII

SEVERITY OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SIZE

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

Severity of Unrest	School Enrollment Size: 0 - 200	201 - 500	501 - 1000	1001 - 2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	More than 5000	TOTAL
Healthy Dissent	1 4.8% 33.3%	1 4.8% 25.0%	3 14.3% 18.8%	13 61.9% 43.3%	2 9.5% 66.7%		1 4.8% 10.0%		21 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical	2 6.9% 66.7%	3 10.3% 75.0%	9 31.0% 56.2%	9 31.0% 30.0%	1 3.5% 33.3%	2 6.9% 40.0%	3 10.3% 30.0%		29 100%
Critical disruption w/ positive impacts				2 66.7% 6.7%			1 33.3% 10.0%		3 100%
Critical disruption w/ negative impacts			1 10.0% 6.2%	1 10.0% 3.3%		3 30.0% 60.0%	3 30.0% 30.0%	2 20.0% 100.0%	10 100%
General rowdiness & adolescent behavior			3 42.8% 18.8%	2 28.6% 6.7%			2 28.6% 20.0%		7 100%
Other				3 100.0% 10.0%					3 100%
TOTAL	3 100%	4 100%	16 100%	30 100%	3 100%	5 100%	10 100%	2 100%	73 100%

Administrative Survey

APPENDIX C

Analysis of High School Students'
Responses to Survey, and Tables

Introduction

At the request of the Commission, administrators responding to the Status Survey of High School Unrest enclosed a list of their graduating seniors (Class of 1971). From all the lists which we received, we took a stratified random sample by school of two hundred students and sent to them the same questionnaire* (with a simplified General Data Page) that had been answered by their administrators. The purpose of this was to obtain a fuller picture of unrest in the high schools of New York State. To overlook student opinions might slant the results of our research and we could not predict whether the students would be in agreement with the administrators or not. We wished to know how they regarded the state of unrest in their schools, what they felt the issues to be and what plans they would have for resolving or averting serious unrest in the future.

Out of the original 200 sampled, 114 or 57% of the students returned their questionnaires to us. The students exhibited a care and thoughtfulness in their preparation of the survey, and a number added additional comments of their own.

---

*A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Profile of the Respondents

Most of the respondents (86%) were students attending public high schools in this state. Seven students attended private schools and nine went to parochial high schools. The majority (90%) also attended co-educational schools. Of the remaining 10%, seven students were enrolled in all-male institutions and four in all-female institutions.

The students were fairly equally divided according to the type of community in which they lived and attended school. Thirty-six came from urban areas with populations of over 100,000; twenty-three from urban areas with population less than 100,000; thirty-one from suburban communities; and twenty-four from the rural parts of the state.

When asked if they intended to continue their education after graduation, only ten did not have such plans. Fifty-nine percent planned to go on to four-year colleges, the rest planned on either a two-year institution or some other form of education.

Type and Severity of the Unrest

Seventy-eight, or 68%, of the respondents felt that there had been some type of activity at their high school in the past two years that could be termed student unrest. The students were asked to categorize the type of unrest that occurred according to three different time periods: (1) the school year 1968-69; (2) the school year 1969-70 through April; (3) after April 30, 1970. This breakdown was intended to reveal any possible patterns in the type of unrest occurring in the high schools, especially any changes due to

the events of May 1970. The types of unrest reported were:

(1) Intellectual Ferment*

(2) Demonstrations (picketing, rallies, teach-ins, liberation classes, sit-ins, boycotts, memorial services, etc.)

(3) Direct Confrontations (forceful occupation of buildings, forceful disruption of classes and other academic proceedings)

(4) Indirect Confrontations** (fire bombings, deliberate vandalism, deliberate large scale destruction of property, etc.)

(5) "Zapism" (beer busts, indiscriminate vandalism, fist-fights, rowdiness, etc.)

The relative frequency of occurrence of different types of unrest remained constant over the three time periods. The most active time period, in terms of the number of incidents of unrest reported, was the school year 1969-70 from September through April.

---

*Intellectual Ferment implies a general atmosphere of dis-ease in the school marked by such things as students' remarks in class, etc. Intellectual ferment precludes any specially organized events such as teach-ins or liberation classes which are categorized as demonstrations.

**While not so indicated in the survey (See Appendix A), Indirect Confrontations are generally situations in which the people involved are unknown. This distinguishes indirect confrontations from direct confrontations in which the participants openly oppose each other - usually the students vs. the administration.

Because the analysis showed no special relationship between time period and type of unrest, the discussion of high school unrest will be confined to the two academic years as a whole. During these two years, 203 incidents of unrest were reported, of which 15 were categorized as type "other". Omitting the "other" category, the relative frequency of the different types of unrest was as follows:

Type of Unrest	Frequency: Number Reported	Frequency: Percent of Total Reported
Intellectual Ferment	41	21.81
Demonstrations	71	37.76
Direct Confrontations	18	9.62
Indirect Confrontations	24	12.76
"Zapism"	34	18.09
Total	188	100.06

Unrest in the high schools appeared most frequently in the form of demonstrations. Only a fifth of the unrest was intellectual ferment, while 40.5% was characterized as the more serious forms of unrest: direct and indirect confrontations and "Zapism".

When asked about the seriousness of the worst case of unrest, the students did not find it generally harmful. Thirty-five and nine-tenths percent felt the unrest was healthy dissent, while 30.8% thought it somewhat harmful, but not critical to the normal functioning of the institution. Twenty and five-tenths percent felt the unrest caused a critical disruption of institutional functions, but most of these believed the disruption resulted in mainly positive impacts.

Types of Unrest by Institution

Public schools experienced all types of unrest with the

greatest percentage of those reported demonstrations (35.1%). These incidents represented 93.2% of all demonstrations reported in the survey. Private schools reported only intellectual ferment and demonstrations, 66.7% of the private school unrest being the former and 33.3% the latter. While the surveyed private parochial schools had no intellectual ferment, 66.7% of the reported unrest at these schools amounted to 5.4% of the demonstrations reported. Thirty-three percent of parochial school unrest was 8.3% of the reported indirect confrontations. Eighteen public schools accounted for 100% of the direct confrontations while 34 public schools reported 100% of the "Zapism".

Severity and Enrollment Size (See Table XII)

Students in schools with enrollments between 4,001 and 5,000 reported occurrences describing each of the degrees of severity. In each instance except "general rowdiness, adolescent misbehavior", the percentage was higher in this size school than any other. Students in these schools (4,001-5,000) mentioned 30.8% of the reported instances of "healthy dissent", 38.9% of the "somewhat harmful but not critical" events, 47% of the "critical disruptions with positive impacts", 57.1% of the critical disruptions with harmful impacts" and but 6.7% of the "general rowdiness".

The only other enrollment category from which students reported events in each of the degrees of severity was the 1,001-2,000 group. These students described 29.3% of the occurrences as healthy dissent, 24.4% as somewhat harmful but not critical to the normal functioning of the school, 14.6% as critical disruption with positive impacts, 7.3% as critical disruptions with negative impacts and 24.4% as general rowdiness and adolescent misbehavior.

Types of Unrest by Enrollment (See Table X)

Students in schools with enrollments between 4,001 and 5,000 students accounted for 53.9% of the instances of intellectual ferment and 55% of the direct confrontations reported. These percentages were the highest in both categories. Such students (in schools 4,001 to 5,000) reported 40.6% of the cases of indirect confrontations; the same percentage of this type of unrest occurred in schools of 1,001 to 2,000. Students in this latter group of schools felt that their schools experienced demonstrations often enough to account for 41.4% of the surveyed cases.

Types of Unrest Related to School Location (See Table IX)

Unrest in the high schools most commonly took the form of demonstrations. Almost half of these demonstrations took place in schools of urban (over 100,000) location. Intellectual ferment, the next most often reported type of unrest, was also usually found in these schools; 36.6% of the total reported. Urban schools (over 100,000) had 32.4% of the reported "Zapism", but this only amounted to 13.1% of the total unrest reported by the students in them. Students in schools of urban (over 100,000) location reported the greatest percentage of unrest in each category, except for intellectual ferment, which was reported as greater in the suburban schools.

Suburban schools, according to the surveyed students, experienced 41.5% of the reported intellectual ferment. Of the reported demonstrations, suburban schools had 32.4%. These demonstrations, plus the intellectual ferment, accounted for 69% of suburban school unrest reported by the students. While the survey responses showed these schools to have the fewest number

of direct confrontations (5.6%), they had the greatest percentage of indirect confrontations reported (41.7%).

Students in schools of urban (under 100,000) location reported an equal number of incidents of Zapism as they did demonstrations, in each case six. The responses attributed five instances of unrest to intellectual ferment and five to indirect confrontations in these schools in urban (under 100,000) locations.

The most commonly reported unrest in rural schools was Zapism (37.5%). Students in rural schools reported four instances of intellectual ferment and four of indirect confrontations.

Seriousness of Unrest Related to School Location (See Table XI)

Most of the unrest was categorized as healthy dissent, the greatest percentage being in schools of suburban location (45.2%). One-third of the healthy dissent was found in schools in urban locations of 100,000 people or more. Thirty-eight and nine-tenths percent of dissent described as somewhat harmful, but not critical, took place in urban areas (over 100,000). Of the rural schools' unrest, 50% of it was also described as somewhat harmful, but not critical.

Almost half of the schools which had critical disruption with positive impacts were in the heavily populated areas. The next largest percentage of this type of disruption was found in suburban locations.

Seventy-one and four-tenths percent of the institutions which had critical disruption with negative impacts were located in urban areas (over 100,000). There were no such incidents in the urban (under 100,000) or rural locations.

The greatest percentage of general rowdiness and adolescent

behavior of 46.7% occurred in urban (under 100,000) schools. This constituted 38.9% of the unrest in this type of urban school.

Major Issues Which Precipitated Unrest

Student responses as to the major issues which precipitated unrest were placed in the same fourteen categories used for the administrators' responses. It is to be noted that these categories are not placed in any rank order according to response:

1. Rules of behavior in school (dress, appearance, smoking).
2. The deaths at Kent State and Jackson State.
3. The war in Vietnam and its expansion into Cambodia.
4. Black problems (identity, curriculum, Black Power groups).
5. Racial relations (black, white and Puerto Rican tensions).
6. Teacher strikes.
7. School budget.
8. Student participation in decision making and policy making.
9. Lack of freedom of expression (censorship, senior privileges, restrictions in class and academic work).
10. Attendance regulations (schedule, overlapping sessions, attendance policy).
11. School services.
12. Curriculum deficiencies.
13. Influence of college students and college publications.
14. Drugs.

The two groups, administrators and students, were in almost total agreement as to which issues apparently precipitated the unrest at their schools. Again, the issues fell into three

major categories:

1. National issues
2. Student demands for increased freedom and power
3. Racial problems

National issues were 35% of the responses by both the administrators and the students. One-fourth (25%) of the replies making up this 35% national issue response mentioned Vietnam or Cambodia. This was so for both administrators and students.

The next most frequently mentioned issues were those that related to the students' personal and academic freedom. These comprised 31% of the administrators' responses and 35% of the student responses. In this area, the students cited lack of participation in policy and decision making more frequently than did administrators (12% vs. 7%).

Students ascribed unrest to racial problems less frequently than the administrators (13% vs. 17%). Eleven and five-tenths percent of the administrators mentioned problems relating to Black Power groups and specialized curriculum demands. The students mentioned this as an issue only 6.3% of the time.

Students also attributed unrest to teachers' strikes, curriculum, school services and attendance regulations.

Of the students in schools in urban (over 100,000) locations who cited national issues, about half mentioned Indo-China. This group (urban, over 100,000) also accounted for 66% of the responses that mentioned Kent or Jackson State as a national issue.

Rules of behavior in school was the predominant issue in rural schools and schools in the smaller urban areas.

Major Issues Which Precipitated Unrest and How the Unrest was Expressed

Demonstrations were the most common means of expression when students reacted to national events and "inside the school" issues, such as quality of school services and student participation in policy making. Only when racial problems were the precipitating factor in bringing about unrest did demonstrations play a role of lesser importance.

Of the unrest reported as concerned with Vietnam, approximately half took the form of demonstrations, while 33.3% of it was reported as intellectual ferment. There were only two instances of direct confrontation and one of indirect confrontation relating to the war issue. Demonstrations and intellectual ferment were the only types of unrest which centered about Kent and Jackson State.

Almost half of the unrest relating to student participation in policy making was evidenced in students' demonstrating. Twenty-two percent of the unrest concerning this issue took the form of "Zapism" (which was never mentioned in connection with issues of national dimensions). Students demonstrated in each case when the quality of school services was an object of contention.

When racial issues were the precipitating factor in unrest there was a more likely chance of direct or indirect confrontations. Unrest that involved racial issues was reported as being asserted through indirect confrontations in 16.7% of the cases.

Personal Conduct Issues Underlying Unrest

The issue of personal conduct which the most students felt to be an underlying factor in causing unrest was the lack of student participation in decision making, the lack of due process

and the excessive discipline and control to which they were subject. Lack of freedom of expression in school followed closely in importance. The next three areas of contention were (1) rules of dress and personal appearance; (2) rules governing smoking and the use of drugs and alcohol; and (3) attendance regulations. Freedom of association and the quality of school services and facilities were the most infrequently mentioned issues.

Student participation in decision making and in the disciplinary system was the issue mentioned most often by students in all except the rural schools and in schools with an enrollment of 0-500. In these schools the rules of dress and appearance assumed the greatest importance.

Students and administrators were in agreement over the personal conduct issues.

Academic Concerns Underlying Unrest

Although curriculum content was mentioned only 4 times in response to the major issues which precipitated unrest, it assumes the greatest importance by the students when they cite academic concerns underlying unrest. Perhaps it is not as manifest as are other problems, but it obviously does present an underlying problem to the students.

The content and viability of the curriculum comprise 23% of the student responses in this area. The next issue of importance to the students is their role in school policy-making: Twenty-one percent of the students indicated they would like to participate to a greater extent. The students are also concerned with the amount of freedom of expression in class and in extracurricular activities, and in the types of teaching they receive.

Issues of lesser importance are modes of scheduling, faculty tenure policy, and the type and content of extracurricular activities. Extracurricular faculty activities was the most infrequently mentioned issue.

Students and administrators only disagreed particularly on two issues. Only 22.7% of the students mentioned viability and content of curriculum, whereas 31.3% of the administrators mentioned this issue. However, curriculum was still the foremost issue in the minds of the students. The issue of freedom of expression in class and extracurricular activities assumed greater importance to the students than to the administrators (15.1% vs. 6.2%).

Larger Social Issues Underlying Unrest*

The greatest discrepancy of opinion between students and administrators, as shown by their responses, concerning the underlying causes of unrest was over which of the larger social issues were responsible factors. Both groups agreed that Southeast Asia and the draft were major among the larger social issues of concern. The administrators, however, attributed unrest to this issue more often than the students (43% vs. 37% of their responses).

On the other hand, more student responses indicated that unrest grew out of dissatisfaction with defense research and other aspects of U. S. military policy (11% of the student responses vs. 4% of the administrative responses). The two groups also

---

*See Appendix A, question 9C of the questionnaire. "Larger social issues" encompass such things as Vietnam and Cambodia, the draft, defense research, military policy, economic and ethnic issues, government attitude toward students and unresponsiveness of government.

disagreed on other governmental issues. More students than administrators attributed unrest to the apparent government attitude toward students (16% vs. 11%); and more students felt unrest was the outgrowth of the apparent unresponsiveness of the government and over its policies (17% vs. 11%).

A small percentage of student and administrative responses mentioned economic inequality and opportunity as an issue. Twice as many of the administrative responses (22% vs. 12%) ascribed unrest to tensions over ethnic identity and inequality.

Approximately 50% of the student responses which mentioned larger social issues as a source of unrest came from students in high schools with enrollments of between 4001 and 5000.

Number of Days the Worst Incident of Unrest Lasted

Since September 1968, 32.7% of the students reported that their worst case of unrest lasted a day or part of a day. Fifty and five-tenths percent had unrest which was of a 2 to 5 day duration during this time. Eleven students stated that their worst case of unrest lasted from 6 to 10 days. Two cases of unrest lasted from 11 to 15 days, both after September 1969. In one school, the worst incident of unrest lasted 21 to 26 days between September 1969 and April 1970; two other cases of unrest lasting 26 days or more occurred one before September 1969 and one after April 30, 1970. Cases of unrest were the most frequent and of the longest duration in the time period from September 1969 to April 1970.

Who Participated in the Unrest?

Sixty-six percent of the student responses indicated that up to 30% of the student body was actively involved in the most serious

case of unrest. At 15% of the high schools in which unrest occurred, from 61% to 90% of the pupils were actively engaged in the disturbances. Only one student reported that 91% to 100% of the student body was involved. The active participants were described by the responding students as having certain characteristics.

The students felt that 70% of the activists were equally divided between the members of the junior and senior classes.

The administrators also reported the juniors and seniors as being the most active participants, but felt that the largest proportion of activists came from the senior class.

The students characterized the activists as predominantly (95%) pupils of high and average achievement. The administrators felt that only 78% of the activists were of high and average achievement. These they placed equally in each category (36% high, 36% average).

Students and administrators were in close agreement over the post-graduation goals and ethnic composition of the student activists. The students reported that 65.1% intend to continue their education in two and four year colleges; 7.1% will attend technical school; 4.8% will attend business school; 4.8% will enter military service; and 15.9% will join the work force. Slightly in excess of 2% of the students had goals other than the foregoing.

A majority of the student activists were described as white (58%), 29% were described as black and 6.7% as being Puerto Rican. The remainder were reported as Oriental, American Indian and other.

ERRATUM

Page A52

Sentence which reads:

"These they placed equally in each category (36% high, 36% average)."

Should read:

"These they placed almost equally in each category (38% high, 40% average)."

Forty-one of the 78 students who reported that unrest had occurred at their schools indicated that persons other than the students at the high school were engaged in unrest.

Roughly one-fourth of these participants were faculty from the same high school and another fourth were students from other high schools. The students reported more faculty from other high schools and more students from other high schools than did the administrators.

The administrators, on the other hand, reported that 17% of the other persons involved were high school dropouts; the students felt that dropouts comprised only 5% of the other persons involved.

Racial or Ethnic Problems

Just over 25% of the student responses indicated that ethnic issues played a major role in precipitating unrest. Of this percentage, about half indicated that feelings of hostility, violent confrontations and open or hidden antagonisms stemmed from ethnic tensions and prejudices. The other half indicated an overall desire for equality of opportunity or a quest for cultural identity among racial or ethnic groups. Twenty-five percent of the administrators also felt that racial or ethnic issues and problems played a major role in germinating unrest. The students mentioned open racism slightly more frequently than the administrators.

Violence and Student Unrest

Instances of violence to persons or substantial physical damage to property accompanying unrest were mentioned fourteen times by the 78 students who reported unrest at their high schools.

Five of the cases were physical violence to persons, while nine were situations of property damage.

Immediate Actions in Response to the Most Serious Instance of Unrest

Students reported the actions taken in response to the most serious case of unrest to be slightly more severe than those reported by the administrators. Thirty-nine percent of the students cited discussions or meetings to resolve grievances and the use of faculty and other staff as mediators or monitors. Almost half of the administrators described this as the action taken.

Disciplinary actions such as suspension, isolation of the participants, or punishment of some other nature was mentioned by 21% of the students and the administrators.

Eight percent of the students experienced a temporary closing of school as a result of disruptive activities; 9% had normal activities suspended and substituted with activities of another nature.

Nineteen percent of the students said that police or security forces were called in to deal with the situation, whereas only 10% of the administrators reported such action.

Long Range Plans for Resolving and/or Averting any Further Serious Unrest

While all students were asked to answer the question, whether or not their school had experienced unrest, twenty did not respond.

Increased communications and interaction among students, faculty, administration, parents and the community was mentioned the most frequently as a method of coping with or preventing unrest

in the future. Thirty-three and six-tenths percent of the students thought increased communications would be effective in resolving problems.

Eighteen students saw more student involvement in policy-decision making as lending an answer. Eight students felt that the selection and training of teachers and administrators to like and relate to students would be an important factor in helping to avert further unrest. Along this line, they also suggested workshops, teach-ins, class discussions on vital issues and improved curriculum and instruction as being good, long-term plans.

Five students thought the number of rules and requirements should be minimized, whereas, seven stated that administrators should have more rigid enforcement of rules in order to resolve or avert unrest.

In summation, the students emphasized the need for open lines of communication, a fresh and relevant learning experience, and for a more viable position for the student in the decision-making process. They were in close accord with the administrators, but the administrators tended to be a bit more liberal.

Twenty-five percent of the administrators as compared to 19% of the students wanted to increase student involvement in the policy and decision making of the school. Twice as many administrators as students would improve curriculum and instruction to meet all levels of interest and intellect (9.6% vs. 4.2%).

In the area of discipline, the students were more severe: 7.3% planned to implement a rigid enforcement of the rules as compared to 1.6% of the administrators.

TABLE IX

TYPE OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL LOCATION

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

School Location

Type of Unrest	Urban More than 100,000	Urban Less than 100,000	Suburban	Rural	TOTAL
Intellectual Ferment	15 36.6% 17.9%	5 12.2% 17.2%	17 41.5% 29.3%	4 9.7% 12.5%	41 100%
Demonstrations	34 47.9% 40.5%	6 8.5% 20.8%	23 32.4% 39.7%	8 11.2% 25.0%	71 100%
Direct Confrontations	13 72.2% 15.4%	1 5.6% 3.4%	1 5.6% 1.7%	3 16.6% 9.4%	18 100%
Indirect Confrontations	5 20.8% 6.0%	5 20.8% 17.2%	10 41.7% 17.2%	4 16.7% 12.5%	24 100%
"Zapism"	11 32.4% 13.1%	6 17.6% 20.7%	5 14.7% 8.6%	12 35.3% 37.5%	34 100%
Other	6 40.0% 7.1%	6 40.0% 20.7%	2 13.3% 3.5%	1 6.7% 3.1%	15 100%
TOTAL	84 100%	29 100%	58 100%	32 100%	203 100%

Student Survey

TABLE X

TYPE OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SIZE

School Enrollment Size

Type of Unrest	0 - 200	201 - 500	501 - 1000	1001 - 2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	Total
Intellectual Ferment	1 2.9% 50.0%	1 2.9% 25.0%	3 8.8% 14.3%	10 29.4% 13.7%	8 2.9% 6.3%		14 52.9% 18.2%	37 100%
Demonstrations	1 1.7% 50.0%	1 1.7% 25.0%	7 12.1% 33.3%	24 41.4% 32.9%	3 6.9% 25.0%		32 36.2% 21.2%	68 100%
Direct Confrontations			1 5.0% 4.8%	6 30.0% 8.2%	10.0% 12.5%		11 55.0% 11.1%	18 100%
Indirect Confrontations		2 6.3% 50.0%	2 6.3% 9.5%	13 40.6% 17.8%	2 6.3% 12.5%		5 40.6% 13.1%	24 100%
"Zapism"			8 18.6% 38.1%	13 30.2% 17.8%	2 7.0% 18.8%		11 44.2% 19.2%	34 100%
Other				7 25.0% 9.6%	4 14.3% 25.0%		4 60.7% 17.2%	15 100%
Total	2 100%	4 100%	21 100%	73 100%	19 100%		77 100%	196 100%

Student Survey

TABLE XI

SEVERITY OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL LOCATION

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

School Location

Severity of Unrest	Urban More than 100,000	Urban Less than 100,000	Suburban	Rural	TOTAL
Healthy Dissent	14 33.3% 32.6%	5 11.9% 27.8%	19 45.2% 50.0%	4 9.5% 22.2%	42 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical	14 38.9% 32.6%	3 8.3% 16.7%	10 27.8% 26.3%	9 25.0% 50.0%	36 100%
Critical disruption w/ positive impacts	8 47.1% 18.6%	3 17.6% 16.7%	4 23.5% 10.5%	2 11.8% 11.1%	17 100%
Critical disruption w/ negative impacts	5 71.4% 11.6%		2 28.6% 5.3%		7 100%
General rowdiness & adolescent behavior	2 13.3% 4.6%	7 46.7% 38.9%	3 20.0% 7.9%	3 20.0% 16.7%	15 100%
TOTAL	43 100%	18 100%	38 100%	18 100%	117 100%

TABLE XII

SEVERITY OF UNREST RELATED TO SCHOOL ENROLLMENT SIZE

(Number and Percentage of Schools)

School Enrollment Size

Severity of Unrest	0 - 200	201 - 500	501 - 1000	1001 - 2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	More than 5000	TOTAL
Healthy Dissent	1 2.6% 100.0%	2 5.1% 50.0%	4 10.2% 25.0%	12 30.8% 29.3%	8 20.5% 61.5%		12 30.8% 30.8%		39 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical		2 5.5% 50.0%	9 25.0% 56.2%	10 27.8% 24.4%	1 2.8% 7.7%		14 38.9% 35.9%		36 100%
Critical disruption, positive impacts			1 5.9% 6.2%	6 35.3% 14.6%	2 11.8% 15.4%		8 47.0% 20.5%		17 100%
Critical disruption, negative impacts				3 42.9% 7.3%			4 57.1% 10.2%		7 100%
General rowdiness & adolescent behavior			2 13.3% 12.5%	10 66.7% 24.4%	2 13.3% 15.4%		1 6.7% 2.6%		15 100%
TOTAL	1 100%	4 100%	16 100%	41 100%	13 100%		39 100%		114 100%

Student Survey

APPENDIX D

Assessment from Comparison
of High School Surveys

Of all the high schools surveyed, only the public schools experienced every type of unrest. This unrest was often expressed in the form of demonstrations, which totaled 66 in the public schools. Public schools also accounted for over 90% of all intellectual ferment[1], demonstrations, direct confrontations[2], indirect confrontations[3], and "Zapism". The severity of unrest reached heights of critical disruption or rowdiness only in the public schools.

The private and parochial schools comprised less than 10% of the healthy dissent and in only three cases was it somewhat harmful. The greatest extent and severity of unrest took place in schools with enrollments ranging from 1001 to 2000 or from 4001 to 5000. There were 84 instances of unrest in schools in urban (over 100,000) locations, 58 in suburban schools, 32 in rural and 29 in urban locations having less than 100,000.

The schools in urban (over 100,000) or suburban locations had the greatest percentage of healthy dissent and critical disruption. The urban (under 100,000) locations had the most general rowdiness.

---

[1]See Appendix B, Page A17

[2,3]See Appendix B, Page A17

Institutions which did not experience unrest tended to be non-coeducational, private or parochial, small, and located in rural areas.

Both students and administrators agreed that the active participants in the unrest were upperclassmen in the junior and senior classes who were high and average achievers. In the main, these activist students intended to continue their educations after graduation in two and four year colleges.

Roughly two-thirds of them were reported as white and one-third as Black.

In addition to these student participants, in fifty percent of the instances of unrest other persons were also involved. These others were students from other high schools and high school dropouts, college students, faculty from the same school, and in a few instances, parents.

Racial and ethnic problems which played a major role in precipitating unrest were reported by one-fourth of the students and administrators from schools in which disturbances occurred. These problems arose only in the public schools and in schools in urban settings with large enrollments.

The two sets of surveys indicate that physical violence to persons or substantial physical damage[4] to property was not a characteristic of all unrest in the high schools in New York State over the two year period studied. However, out of the 298 reported instances of unrest, eight or 2.7% were accompanied by physical

---

[4]See Appendix A, Question Number 11.

violence and twelve or 4% were accompanied by substantial physical damage to property. Thus, in roughly one out of every seven cases of unrest, there was either physical violence or substantial physical damage to property.

The survey question referring only to substantial physical damage allowed for a highly subjective answer by the respondents. It appears that the answers precluded all the less serious incidents of damage to property, which cumulatively may be quite serious and expensive.

The greatest intensity of unrest occurred from September 1969 to April 1970. There was only one instance of physical violence to persons and four cases of substantial property damage during this time. From May 1, 1970 until the end of the school year there were reported seven instances of physical violence and eight cases of substantial property damage which accompanied unrest. Academic concerns underlying unrest, curriculum content and quality of teaching were mentioned frequently by students.

Both students and administrators believed that national issues were the major cause of unrest. Of almost equal magnitude were the issues involving student freedoms affecting their personal and academic behavior, and their lack of power in participating in the policy and decision making which governs them. The third area of issues most frequently cited were racial issues.

Students from the urban schools are the most likely to be involved in larger social issues, but students from these schools focused less on national military issues and were the most concerned about ethnic identity and inequality.

Fifty percent of all unrest lasted a duration of from two to five days and one out of three times 1% to 10% of the student body was participating. Fifteen percent of the unrest had over 60% of the student body involved.

A strengthening of all lines of communication and a willingness to listen with understanding, was cited as an integral plan for the future. Students also felt if their educational experience were to be more innovative and diversified and relevant, unrest would be a less likely occurrence of the future. Also, some thought discontent would be lessened if students were given a larger say in the directing of their school lives.

Both administrators and students noted that national issues were intertwined with local school issues in bringing about unrest.

Do Students and Administrators Agree?

When administrators' responses are compared to students' responses from the same school, it is found there are 72 instances of agreement regarding the question of whether unrest was experienced by their institution. There were 13 cases of disagreement over whether there was any unrest.

Rarely, do administrators and students concur in regard to the nature of the unrest (whether it was categorized as demonstrations, confrontations, etc.). There were 59 instances of disagreement about the nature of unrest and 6 agreements.

Likewise, the seriousness of the unrest was viewed differently by the students and administrators. There were only 5 cases of concurrence in this area and 60 times the students differed from the administrators.

However, when the entire questionnaire is examined, the students and administrators basically agreed as to the description of the student activists, the amount of violence, the duration of the unrest, the major issues which precipitated unrest and the issues underlying unrest, the role of racial and ethnic issues and problems, and their long-range plans for solving or averting unrest in the future.

From the responses it appears that the student views unrest much as does the administrator, but this similarity of perception is rarely communicated. Even where the students or administrators or faculty sense this common outlook, seldom does anyone proceed with faith in an eventual mutual understanding.

APPENDIX E

New York City Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners in the City of New York consists of four appointed members plus the chief administrative officer of the city school systems or his representative. All members other than the Chancellor of the New York City Schools, after a probationary period, receive life tenure at a present salary of $33,000 a year. The yearly budget for the Board of Examiners is approximately $3,500,000.

APPENDIX F

AGREEMENT between THE BOARD OF EDUCATION of the City of New York and UNITED FEDERATION OF TEACHERS Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO covering DAY SCHOOL CLASSROOM TEACHERS and PER SESSION TEACHERS September 8, 1969 - September 8, 1972.

ARTICLE XXII

NO-STRIKE PLEDGE

The Union and the Board recognize that strikes and other forms of work stoppages by teachers are contrary to law and public policy. The Union and the Board subscribe to the principle that differences shall be resolved by peaceful and appropriate means without interruption of the school program. The Union therefore agrees that there shall be no strikes, work stoppages, or other concerted refusal to perform work, by the employees covered by this agreement, nor any instigation thereof.

APPENDIX G

PROFILE OF A NEW YORK CITY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

This coeducational junior high school is located in a ghetto area in Brooklyn. It has on register pupils grades 7-9. The school was organized some fifteen years ago and is housed in a modern building.

Of the approximately 1800 pupils, 75% or 3 out of 4 do not have both parents living at home. In almost all of these one parent homes, the parent is a mother. Fathers in this area living with their families are distinctly in the minority. The school has more than 100% mobility rate, that is, during each school year over 50% on register at the beginning transfer and are replaced by pupils transferring into the neighborhood and, therefore, into the school. The staff as is the case in most junior high schools in ghetto areas, is very young. Regular teachers who have finished probation tend to transfer when they are eligible.

The problems in the school are a reflection of the problems of the community which sends its students to the school. There has been in recent years serious incidents of drug abuse. The face of violence shows itself frequently in assaults in the yard, on the way to and from school and, indeed, within the school. The victims and the perpetrators of these assaults are almost always pupils. On occasion a teacher may be struck,

but this is an unusual circumstance. More than 10% of the student body is on active court referral.

Thus, the daily routine of the school is marred by constant disorders and disturbances in class rooms, particularly those taught by younger or less efficient teachers and especially in large problem spaces such as the cafeteria and the play yard. The average middle-class society recommends "talking to the pupil", "sending for his father" or "disciplining" him. Yet none of these are realistic approaches. These desparately under-privileged youngsters have no home, in the sense which Americans believe should exist; many of them have had from their earliest days, brushes with the law. A visit to school or a talk with a guidance counsellor means nothing. Even the Bureau of Child Guidance, which may furnish a half-hour interview a month, cannot answer the question of how to have the disturbed youngster relate to his fellow pupils during the rest of the month.

When a principal finds that all guidelines,techniques available to him cannot prevent the pupil from disturbing his classmates while they are attempting to learn, cannot effectively guarantee the absence of violence in the cafeteria or halls, cannot deal with a student who is abusing drugs, or having sold them, is on probation back in the school, his last recourse is suspension.

APPENDIX H

A CASE STUDY OF UNREST AT

"HIGH SCHOOL A"

HIGH SCHOOL A

The High School opened in the middle 1960's to replace two smaller schools, one a vocational high school and regular academic high school. The latter school was the "neighborhood" school for a closely knit, middle-class community, and was 99% white. The subject school has inherited many of the characteristics of the old academic high school. Ten percent of its 1650 students are black who live in or near the inner city. The student body includes a small number of Puerto Rican and American Indian students, as well as whites from various socio-economic classes. The principal said that the achievement scores of students, when plotted, make a bell-shape curve. The High School is a modern building complete with air conditioned, windowless classrooms, connected by a two-way intercom system. Three teachers are black, seventy-seven are white.

UNREST IN 1969-71

There have been two major incidents of unrest, both precipitated by racial issues:

A. On a day in the Spring of 1969 a group of black students met in a classroom at 10:00 a.m., complaining that on the previous day a group of white students had disrupted a basketball game at a city park by shouting obscenities and racial slurs. This group of blacks, refused to attend classes. A discussion was had with the principal and both black and white students who had been involved in the incident.

At lunch time the entire black enrollment refused to go to classes. Minor fights broke out as tension increased. Finally at 1:30 p.m., the principal sent home all black students. The following morning approximately five hundred white students refused to attend classes. Later in the morning a general meeting was held in the gymnasium to discuss the situation. Throughout the day, meetings were held in classrooms to discuss the racial problems at the School.

The third day was one of continual discussion in classrooms, with another general assembly.

A former teacher at the School adds to this account that on the first day the faculty and administration appeared to have the situation under control, when the arrival of the police, called without the knowledge of the principal, angered the black students. This former teacher thus blames the use of police for aggravating unrest.

B. On a Monday in the Fall of 1970, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:15 a.m. a group of 50 black students moved through the halls, confronting white students, fights ensued. The principal, requesting that all students go directly to their homerooms, called the police. Order was established by 8:30 a.m. One hundred black students gathered in the auditorium. At 10:00 a.m. the black students were sent home and at 11:00 a.m. the white students were sent home. As a result of this incident, five students received minor injuries, and 25 students were suspended, the latter were equally black and white.

On Tuesday, the day following this violence, the School was closed entirely. It reopened Wednesday with seniors attending

in the morning and juniors in the afternoon. On Thursday, sophomores attended in the morning. Normal class schedules resumed Friday with, however, considerable absenteeism.

The stabbing of a black youth at a nearby junior high school on the preceding Friday afternoon apparently triggered this incident. At the time, it was believed by black students that a white student at the High School had stabbed the youth. This rumor was false. The principal said that he felt there had been a general mood of unrest in the black community late in the summer, partially attributable to a shooting of a black youth by a policeman.

It is the belief of some whites, both staff and students, that this disruption was carefully planned over the weekend with the knowledge of some black community leaders. In support of this view, one teacher noted that some black leaders arrived on the scene before the police. The black students with whom we spoke denied this conspiracy view.

Other minor disorders have occurred. In December, 1969, a basketball referee was attacked by a gang of youths after a game. During the Fall of 1969 and Spring of 1970, there were small numbers of students who attempted to stage walk-outs connected with anti-war sentiment.

Administrators feel that in addition to racial tensions, absenteeism and loitering in the halls during class hours are problems.

During May, 1970, the School did not experience disorder as did other of the city high schools. Lack of disorder at a time of general school unrest seems to be explained by intense school

spirit. This school spirit was attributed to an outstanding basketball team and a Spring cultural event. Also, class leaders worked hard to maintain order. One administrator said that disruptions may have been prevented by the presence at the school of some outside speakers during this period discussing topics related to the war. Yet, a large number of students and faculty were apparently unaware of the fact that speakers came to the school. The Cambodian issue was not important to most students.

There was no significant involvement by students from other schools in the unrest.

ACTION TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO UNREST

A number of immediate actions were taken in the two cases of serious unrest:

1. Police called in
2. Temporary closing of school
3. Discussions were held to attempt to resolve grievances
4. Faculty and other staff were used as mediators
5. Suspension of participants in conflicts

As there was disruption in a number of the city schools, there were a number of community-wide actions taken in Fall, 1970:

1. Two plain-clothes policemen were assigned to each high school
2. A rumor control office was established
3. A Blue-Ribbon Committee was established to hold hearings and conduct studies concerning campus unrest

A number of long-range actions have been taken or are being planned for resolving unrest:

1. After the disruptions of the Spring of 1969, the High School Advisory Council was formed. This group consisted of six black, six white, and six faculty representatives all elected by the students. Its role was intended to be advisory and not decision-making on matters connected to racial tensions. Although the Advisory Council has discussed a number of important topics, it was the feeling of most members present at the meeting we attended that it has become just "a way to keep the lid on." Its ineffectiveness is in part due to the fact that this year three of the black student members have boycotted the meetings protesting the handling of the "cheerleading situation." It was their contention and the "decision" of an Advisory Council meeting that more black cheerleaders be added to the squad. Since adding to the squad would have resulted in a violation of league rules, the principal did not permit the additions.
2. A Police Information Officer is in the school replacing the plain-clothes policemen.
3. Hall Monitors try to keep students in class.
4. A Black History course is offered, and there is an increased use of black literature in English classes.

Also, courses in Urban Sociology and human relations are offered.

5. The principal meets regularly with the interested parent groups. Also, he makes time available for informal conversations with students.
6. There are two proposals under consideration:
   A. An Action Team would be composed of a nucleus of six teachers, eighteen students, one member of the administration staff, community consultants, and six parents. It would deal directly with some of the problems which hinder both teachers and students. Such problems as racial tensions, communications between students, teachers, and administrations, and conditions in the community which affect what happens in the classroom are some of the things with which the Action Team would be concerned.
   B. A reform of the English curriculum giving students more electives and dropping the distinction between basic and regents courses is being considered.

CAUSAL FACTORS OF UNREST

Name-calling and a stabbing triggered the incidents of unrest. Following are what administrators, faculty, students, and parents believed to be the causes of unrest.

General factors, especially societal, such as violence in America and the problems of slum life which are often cited in

studies are deemphasized here, since such factors were seldom mentioned by those with whom we talked.

Those things which it seems the school can do something about are emphasized.

1. Black-White Relations - The school, according to one teacher, is "the unfortunate situation in which you have black students who are 'with it' mixed with white students who are 'squares'". This is an overstatement, but unrest centers on racial issues. According to one administrator, it is the only problem which has played a role in precipitating unrest. In answer to the question, "How are things here?" only one teacher did not mention racial tension.

For the most part, black students and white students do not talk with each other except in formal situations, such as the classroom and athletics. The failure to communicate is apparent in the Advisory Council meetings.

The black students with whom we talked tend to view much administrative and faculty action as mere tokenism. The attempts of some administration and teachers to "communicate" by using up-to-date language such as "right-on" were viewed as insincere and corny.

During the school year of 1969-70, the black students planned to stage a black cultural program. However, in their judgment, this program was taken over by administrators and faculty and made a world cultural program.

Most of the white students and many of the white faculty with

whom we talked fail to understand the black experience. Whites from a low socio-economical status - one of whom believes that all "colored" waste money on cars and gambling (this student grew up with black children and "was not prejudiced until blacks began engaging in riots"); as well as white student leaders fail to understand blacks. For example, in a conversation with white members of the Advisory Council, such expressions as "Negro","those people", and "What do they want?" were used. They seemed unaware that black students find such expressions offensive. Many white students seemed to fail to realize that black students are very concerned about their dignity and individuality.

A coach said that he treated all students, black and white, who went out for his team the same, even if certain expressions and behaviors were offensive to blacks. In support of the fact that no black athletes played on his team, he said, "they just don't come out". Black students said that blacks do not go out for his team because they believe him to be a racist.

On the other hand, a number of white students indicated that sincere efforts to cooperate with blacks were met by a lack of positive response by blacks.

The increased use of black literature in the English Department is viewed by some white teachers as "trouble-causing, not constructive"; whereas one black teacher indicated that it is giving them a touch of their own medicine.

2. Double Standards - From the point of view of white students double standards concern particular incidents. For example,

there were white students who pointed out that there are times when white student groups are forced to disband in the halls, whereas similar black groups are ignored by faculty. These students believe this differential treatment is due to teachers' fear of black students. Also noted was the fact that a white student was suspended from school for involvement in incidents of unrest; whereas a black student was not suspended for similar involvement.

From the black students' point of view, the double standard is seen more as a general matter, that is, of their being in a white middle-class school, forced to obey its rules. We talked with black students who feel that police try harder to apprehend black students who harm whites, than they try to apprehend white students who do harm to blacks.

3. Educators' View that Education is Equivalent to Schooling - A number of students indicated that administrators and faculty felt that learning did not occur outside the classroom, in such events as peace rallies and in election campaigns. "Prison" was the term some students used in referring to the school. There is a great emphasis on order. For example, hall monitors are used to keep students in classes. Also during the week we visited the school, a policy of locking homerooms at 8:15 a.m. was instituted in an effort to get students in homerooms on time and to "catch" those who were tardy. One teacher and at least a number of students voiced the opinion that by doing this, the administration was only "getting at effects, not causes, that is, people are in halls

because of bad teaching".

Some teachers deal easily with disruption in the classroom but others find disruptions troublesome. For example, one teacher was able to use the interference of the school's intercom system, as well as occasional disruptions in the classrooms, to make points pertaining to his topic. Whereas, another teacher complained because a student missed 20 minutes of class to talk with us.

4. Faculty, Student, Administration Relationships -

A major issue at the School today is student-teacher relationships. Teachers said that they felt that students were no longer willing to accept the responsibilities of being students; they merely wanted certain equal rights. These teachers felt that patterns of authority were breaking down.

Some faculty members have succeeded in truly being friends with students, while other faculty attempt to be buddies of the students. Although they use the phraseology and the informal style that students appear to like, such teachers do so superficially. Students are quick to recognize that these are not genuine friends.

One faculty member said of some of his colleagues, "their problem is that they don't like people - they don't know how to be human; it isn't that they don't like blacks". He added that administration treats faculty like children, not professionals. Students also complained of being treated like children, not as young adults.

5. School Spirit - School spirit at the High School centers on sports and non-academic activities such as the Spring 1970 Cultural Event. The school has failed to relate school spirit and academic matters.

In 1970-71, there seems to be a general sense of apathy among a large number of the students. Those with whom we talked attributed apathy for the most part to a lack of interest in athletic teams and the fact that nothing like a Spring Cultural Event was planned.

6. Parental Attitudes - Faculty and students generally agreed that parental attitudes - even indifference ("It is all too often indifference towards education", noted an administrator) - influence students' attitudes.

A pointed example of parental influence is that for the most part students from the site area of the School with whom we talked do not understand or like blacks.
This fact is not hard to understand when one considers that recently, residents of this area vigorously attempted to block the building of low and middle-income integrated housing in the area.

APPENDIX I

A CASE STUDY OF UNREST AT

"HIGH SCHOOL B"

A83

HIGH SCHOOL B

The High School, built in the 1930's, has an enrollment of 2600 students in grades seven through twelve. Thirty-five per cent of these students are black and eight per cent are Puerto Rican. Also there are a number of first generation immigrants, many of whom speak little English and two hundred special education students. Forty per cent of the students' families earn less than $3,500. per year.

In addition to 140 classroom teachers, principal, and vice-principal, The High School has five deans, eight counselors, a full-time psychologist, and part-time social services. However, fewer than ten staff members are black including the vice-principal and two counselors.

At least from the point of view of administrators, the curriculum is innovative and flexible including such things as four different Black history courses, independent studies, English as a second language, and proposed courses in Puerto Rican culture and mini-courses. The School has a Black Student Union and a Puerto Rican Student Union, as well as a student government.

UNREST IN 1969-1971

In the spring of 1970 an assembly was held at the end of Black Afro-American Week. The performers from outside the school

HIGH SCHOOL B

were obscene in the judgment of many white students; thus they walked out of the assembly. Although there was no violence, this incident tended to polarize feelings.

In the Fall of 1970, as a result of students' demands, an "impromptu" assembly was held. During the assembly, students, principally black and Puerto Rican, made their "gripes" known. After two hours, it was agreed that representatives of various groups would meet to continue discussions. The assembly was dismissed. However, major fighting broke out. It was necessary for the police to use force to restore order. A number of white students were injured seriously and approximately 20 students were suspended. The principal noted that a number of students from other schools and other people, were in the school during the incident. A scheduled recess began one day early. School reopened the following Monday.

Shortly after school reconvened, both black and Puerto Rican students issued lists of demands having to do with matters such as fairer treatment of black and Puerto Rican students, greater emphasis in the curriculum on black and Puerto Rican culture, and the legitimacy of the black and Puerto Rican student unions. Also white groups picketed the school carrying signs saying "clean it up or shut it down."

HIGH SCHOOL B

Subsequently, 100 black students walked out of school. The apparent reason for the walkout was that they thought school was to have been dismissed at noon for parent conferences and it wasn't. The president of the Black Student Union was suspended because of his role in organizing the walkout. At a school board hearing--the first on the issue of suspension--the suspension was upheld and the student was assigned to another high school. At the time of this study, the student had announced that he would fight the transfer in the courts.

The School is still in a state of unrest. A member of the Principal's Advisory Council (made up of teachers) indicated his surprise that the school board's decision had not triggered another walkout by black students. Another said that many teachers are afraid and morale is low. Other teachers are beginning to feel that "you lose no matter what you do." For example, a teacher said that last year he had lost pay picketing in support of an integration plan and this year he testified in support of the Black Student Union's president, but nevertheless, his name is on a list of "prejudiced teachers" circulating in the Black Community.

ACTION TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO UNREST

A number of actions are being undertaken to prevent further violence, as well as to improve the educational situation:

1. Group and individual meetings with parents, administrators, and teachers are being conducted. Efforts are being made to organize a Parent-Teacher-Student Association.

HIGH SCHOOL B

2. A Faculty-Student Grievance Committee is being formed to develop and implement grievance procedures for use when normal processes have failed to provide an acceptable solution to a student's complaint.
3. The demands made by black and Puerto Rican students are being negotiated.
4. Curriculum changes and additions, especially in the area of black and Puerto Rican culture, bi-lingual programs, and elective mini-courses, are planned.
5. Sensitivity training of staff members is planned. Also, during the Christmas vacation a small number of teachers and students had a retreat to discuss matters such as teaching and human relations.
6. Report card procedures and other school policies are under discussion.

CAUSES OF UNREST

1. Black, Puerto Rican, White Relationships - Although the incidents of unrest were confrontations between black students and white teachers and students, two black senior staff members indicated that unrest was not primarily racial in nature. They believe that students have a large number of common problems, such as poverty and the need for a "humanized" education.

HIGH SCHOOL B

However, most other staff members view the issue in terms of race. One teacher said that in a one to one relationship black and white students often get along, but in a mob, one is black or white. Some white students said, and black students suggested, that blacks and whites can have superficial friendships, but "if a white stands in the way of a black's progress, the white would be trampled on." Puerto Rican and black students exhibit a general mistrust of white teachers, administrators, and students.

Both whites and blacks said that double standards exist in the school. Yet there was sentiment among white students and teachers that the suspended black student leader was "gotten rid of", suspended,for a minor infraction. Whereas some black students interviewed said that he got what he deserved.

2. Institutional Racism - "Institutional racism in education is," said a teacher," when administration, faculty, and curriculum do not understand enough of minority culture." To a large extent the demands made by the black and Puerto Rican students are said to be attempts to stop this racism.

A view often expressed is that counselors stereotype minority group students. "Blacks are quickly put into non-regents classes so they will not hurt good white kids, which in turn keeps black out of college" said a white teacher. Puerto Rican and black students stated they do not get the help they need from counselors.

On the other hand, a black counselor argued that, granting there is a high percentage of black students in non-regents and remedial classes, everything possible is done to put black students into regents classes, but "many black students will not accept placement there."

A number of black students said that the attitude of many teachers, including some blacks is racist. An example often cited is that some teachers have openly criticized some black students for "keeping their babies."

Black and Puerto Rican students feel that there are not enough courses and activities which reflect their experiences. Also they believe that they have no real voice in the governance of the school.

Another factor is that there are very few black and Puerto Rican staff members. However, the principal noted that a major factor concerning this matter is that many of the best black teachers are "lost to administration."

3. Irrelevant Curriculum and Poor Teaching - A number of people, both students and staff said that the curriculum is "outdated, not meeting the needs and interests of students." Puerto Rican and black students feel that their courses do not help them to better understand themselves and their cultures. Students indicated that their classes did not give them an opportunity to

discuss matters important to them. Also, a number of students said that school did not teach them skills which would make them employable after high school. "High school is too college oriented" in the judgment of students and at least one senior staff member.

Students have a number of non-racial grievances against teachers. As a senior staff member said, "Some are imagined, some are real." Many teachers are not trained to teach in inner city schools. And, thus, said a young teacher, "They have little empathy with the problems of poor kids." It is not only minority cultures which teachers fail to understand. One teacher put the point this way, "Teachers are generally people who like to study. They have trouble understanding people who have no interest in learning."

One administrator said that many teachers fail to see students as individuals and also fail to "grasp the teachable moments."

On the other hand, a teacher suggested that some of the problem is that teachers are expected to solve all types of problems; "their role is no longer just to turn kids on to English."

4. Non-makers in School - Non-makers are students who for various reasons do not succeed in school. They tend to be poor readers and to have poor attendance and discipline records because of their frustrations with school. A group of teachers pointed out

that there are at least 500 non-makers, many of whom are black, who are "not issue oriented, but form a group ready to engage in violence when occasions to do so arise."

5. Student Attitudes- Various staff members said that students' attitudes have changed. In their judgment the following attitudes on the part of many students lead to unrest:

A. An unwillingness to accept evolution rather than revolution. "Kids want everything now; they don't want to understand the limits under which administrators work."

B. Greater emphasis on irrationality and feelings. For example, a teacher reported that students were unwilling to disbelieve certain "bad things" about the principal, even though the teacher had "proven" them false.

C. A general feeling of apathy among students. "Inner city kids have little interest in education."

D. A sense of no longer being passive. One teacher said, "Students are now a vocal minority."

E. A strong sense of freedom, of individual rights, "I can do what I want," without a willingness to accept responsibilities.

HIGH SCHOOL B

F. A giving up of basic values, such as truth and right.

G. An attitude that most teachers no longer have anything to offer them. Also, "kids do not think they can learn from a teacher whom they dislike."

H. A great fear on the part of black and Puerto Rican students of being called an Uncle Tom.

Students on the other hand, complain that they have no power to discuss and to try to solve problems which affect them. They maintain that they are adults and should be given an important role in school governance.

6. Administration - Although the administrators said the faculty was unified in support of administrative actions this fall, a large number of teachers, as well as students, indicated that unrest was in part due to administrative failure.

A white student leader complained that the principal lacks charisma and leadership qualities; thus, the students said that he could not relate to him or look up to him. Also, it was noted by some teachers and students that the administration acted too slowly and failed to take clear stands on important issues. One student said, referring to the principal, "nobody hears him."

A teacher added, "the principal also does not know how to listen."

Whether fairly or unfairly, a large number of people at The High School, have lost trust in and respect for administration. One teacher said, "No one trusts the principal except a small number of faculty and his deans."

Three members of the physical education department complained that for years the administration covered up the fact that incidents of violence go on day after day. One said that the deans gave the faculty little support in disciplining students. Another added, "The structure does not permit teaching any more. I am just a baby sitter."

7. Poor Communications - An administrator said that a principal's student sounding board was established in 1969; however, students were not aware of this organization. One student said that school has a bureaucratic system which involves too much red tape to change it.

An administrator said that there are "deliberate breakdowns in communications by design of some student leaders who have not reported to their constituents the agreements reached and progress made." A teacher noted that in his judgment the cause of one walkout, was black student's failure to know the status of the

negotiations of their demands. A number of white students indicated they were unable to find out the status of such things as the Grievance Committee.

8. The Role of Parents - A number of teachers noted that many parents believe their children's story more than the school's which often results in rumors and increased anger in the community. One administrator said that there was "adult input" into the serious incidents of unrest.

APPENDIX TO PART II

APPENDIX J

TEMPORARY STATE COMMISSION

TO STUDY THE CAUSES OF CAMPUS UNREST

Charles D. Henderson, Chairman

STATUS SURVEY OF COLLEGE UNREST II

For the Latter Part of the

Spring 1970 Semester

June, 1970

241

A98

GENERAL DATA

I. NAME OF INSTITUTION _____

II. LOCATION _____

III. TYPE (check one only)

A. Public

1. ____ Community College - CUNY
2. ____ Community College - SUNY
3. ____ Agr. and Tech. - SUNY
4. ____ Four year or higher - CUNY
5. ____ Four year or higher - SUNY

B. Private

1. ____ Two year - sectarian
2. ____ Two year - non-sectarian
3. ____ Four year or higher - sectarian
4. ____ Four year or higher - non-sectarian

IV. ENROLLMENT (please give numbers)

A. 1. Male _____
2. Female _____
3. Total _____

B. 1. Undergraduate _____
2. Graduate _____
3. Other _____

V. OTHER DATA (please give all requested information)

1. Percent of faculty holding earned doctorates ____
2. Percent of students holding N.Y.S. Regents Scholarships ____
3. Percent of students holding National Merit Scholarships ____
4. Instructional expenditures per student in last fiscal year ____
5. Do you have a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa? (Institutions of four years or higher only need respond) ____
6. Are you fully accredited by the Middle States Association? (2-yr. Institutions only need respond.) ____
7. What percent of your students are from each of the following Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA)?

a) New York City SMSA ____
b) Binghamton SMSA ____
c) Albany SMSA ____
d) Utica SMSA ____
e) Syracuse SMSA ____
f) Rochester SMSA ____
g) Buffalo SMSA ____

NAME OF INSTITUTION: _____

Instructions: The following questions are to be answered as concisely as possible in spaces provided. Use your best objective judgment rather than seeking absolute precision in answering the questions. All answers should refer to the period between April 30, 1970 and the end of the Spring 1970 Semester.

1.A. Was there any activity on your campus which could in any sense be called campus unrest?

yes _____ If no, turn to the bottom of the last page
no _____ and provide the required information.

1.B. Please check the one of the following which is most applicable to your situation.

a. _____ Intellectual ferment

b. _____ Demonstrations (picketing, rallies, teach-ins, liberation classes, sit-ins, boycotts, memorial services, etc.)

c. _____ Direct confrontations (forceful occupation of buildings, forceful disruption of classes and other academic proceedings, etc.)

d. _____ Indirect confrontations (firebombings, vandalism, window-breaking, large scale destruction of property, etc.)

e. _____ Other (specify)

2. Were the issues surrounding the most serious cases of unrest in this period related mainly to:

a. _____ your campus only
b. _____ the local surrounding community only
c. _____ the larger society only
d. _____ all of the above
e. _____ a & b
f. _____ a & c
g. _____ b & c

3. In your estimation, how serious was the worst instance of unrest?

a. _____ healthy dissent

b. _____ somewhat harmful to the normal functioning of the college, but not critical

c. _____ critical disruption of college functions with mainly positive impacts

d. _____ critical disruption of college functions with mainly negative impacts

e. _____ other (specify)

4.A. In your estimation, what proportion of the student body was actively involved in the most serious case of unrest?

_____ proportion

4.B. Were any members of your student body involved as counter-demonstrators, and if so, what proportion?

_____ yes _____ proportion

_____ no

5. In your estimation, what proportion of the students remained totally neutral or aloof during the most serious instance of unrest?

_____ proportion

6. Was any case of unrest accompanied by physical violence to persons?

yes _____
no _____

7. Was any case of unrest accompanied by substantial physical damage to property?

yes _____
no _____

8. Was any case of unrest accompanied by a stoppage of class for the majority of students?

yes _____ If yes, please check _____ voluntary stoppage
no _____ _____ involuntary stoppage

9. What was the longest duration in days of the unrest in this (4/30/70 through the end of the Spring semester 1970) period?

_____ days

10A. How many class days were lost with resulting positive impacts?

_____ days

10B. How many class days were lost which resulted in either negative impacts or simply wasted days?

_____ days

11A. Do you feel the unrest, and in some instances disorders, experienced during this period, was <u>qualitatively</u> different from that previously experienced?

yes _____
no _____

11B. If yes, what particular qualities characterize the difference in the nature of the unrest? (check all which may apply)

a. _____ the fact that this campus had not previously experienced any unrest

b. _____ the number of students involved was significantly greater

c. _____ the number of students involved was significantly smaller

d. _____ the number of incidents was significantly greater

e. _____ the number of incidents was significantly smaller

f. _____ the unrest assumed a significantly greater degree of severity

g. _____ the unrest assumed a significantly lesser degree of severity

h. _____ the scope (breadth) of the unrest was wider

i. _____ the scope (breadth) of the unrest was narrower

j. _____ the numbers of faculty and administrators actively involved increased

k. _____ the number of faculty and administrators actively involved decreased

l. _____ a noted presence of an outside organizational nexus

m. _____ a noted absence of an outside organizational nexus

n. _____ student energies have been channeled into legitimate or socially approved avenues of behavior

o. _____ the number of issues has decreased

p. _____ the number of issues has increased

q. _____ the target of the unrest has changed

r. _____ the substance of the issues has changed

s. _____ other (specify)

t. _____ other (specify)

Make additional comments in the space below. If you checked either "q" or "r", please elaborate.

12. What were the major issues which precipitated the unrest. Please list them in order.

13. Briefly describe what you feel to be some of the major impacts of any unrest which may have occurred on your campus during this period in respect to both the institution and the greater society.

APPENDIX K

EXTENT AND NATURE OF UNREST ON UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE CAMPUSES
(Spring of 1970)

Preface

The Commission and staff point out that changes have taken place on the college campuses since this survey was conducted and since the results were tabulated. May 1970, (sometimes called the time of the first national students' strike) on New York State campuses is qualitatively and quantitatively reflected in this survey.

Even though conditions have changed since that date, as has been discussed in other parts of this report, we consider that the results of the survey are urgent because of the identification and definition of the patterns observed.

Since May of 1970, there have been some shifts in student reaction, primarily in their reaction to internal governance, curricula, faculty, grievance, etc. The losing of tensions from these causes has in part been the result of the positive response by university administration and faculty. However, this Commission has reason to feel that the danger of further interruptions is very real.

The fact that new eruptions might be due less to internal academic factors than to social and national and international factors is no reason for complacency on the part of anyone. If the internal factors have been lessened as causes, it has been solely due to the fact that university authorities have been far more responsive to changing those things, which they can change, than have been other segments of our society. Insofar as govern-

ment and its policies are concerned, we find no change in student attitudes since May of 1970.

Introduction

The extent and complexity of a study of unrest on the campuses of our colleges and universities is reflected in the diversity of the material gathered. In addition to public hearings, on-campuses visits, interviews and correspondence, the Commission used the instrument of the questionnaire. The questionnaire cannot replace first-hand experience, nor was it intended to do so. There were 33 on-campus visits made which included interviews as well as general observation. The purpose of the questionnaire was to be an additional measure of campus unrest, one which in spite of limitations of time and personnel had its own special qualities: every institution in the State could be visited, in a uniform and objective way.

The purposes of this questionnaire entitled "Status Survey of College Unrest II for the Latter Part of the Spring 1970 Semester"* were threefold. The first was to obtain a gauge or descriptive measure of what was happening on the campuses of this State at a time when the nation was in turmoil over the invasion into Cambodia and the killings at Kent and Jackson State. We wanted to know what forms of campus unrest were occurring, how severe were they, how many students were involved, what were the issues and lastly, what were the impacts of any unrest on the institution and on the greater society.

* A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix J.

The second purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain possible predictors of unrest. Is it peculiar to certain types of institutions? Is institution size a determinant? Are certain specific issues related to different types of institutions?

Thirdly, we hoped to compare unrest in the Spring of 1970 with unrest in the preceding two years to see if there were any quantitative or qualitative differences. This analysis was done with a question in the survey itself and through a comparison of this year's results and those obtained last year in the questionnaire "Preliminary Status Survey of College Unrest for the Academic Years 1967-68 and 1968-69

General Findings

The survey sampled the chief college administrators of all the 212 institutions of higher learning in New York State. Of these, 96% or 203 institutions responded. A profile of these institutions has been given earlier describing their type of administration, size, programs, faculty, scholarship students and accreditation status.

Of the 203 colleges and universities which responded to the questionnaire, 156 (76%) experienced what the administrators felt to be some form of unrest. The most frequent type of unrest experienced, 74% or 115 institutions, was categorized as demonstrations (picketing, rallies, teach-ins, liberation classes, sit-ins, boycotts, memorial services, etc.). Seventeen percent of the unrest was categorized as intellectual ferment. Only 9%, or 15 institutions, experienced confrontations which were either direct or indirect in nature.

The type of unrest is not truly indicative of the campus situation and therefore, severity of unrest was also measured. Fifty-two institutions felt the activities on their campuses to be healthy dissent. The majority, 54%, felt the unrest had been somewhat harmful to the normal functioning of the institution, but not critical. Nineteen institutions, or 12% of the total, experienced a critical disruption of college functions.

Institutions with Unrest Categorized as Intellectual Ferment

Intellectual ferment was the predominating form of unrest at 26 of the 156 institutions at which unrest occurred. 57.7% of the administrators categorized this unrest as healthy dissent. The remaining 42.3% felt it to be somewhat harmful to the normal functioning of the institution. (See Table I)

The institutions involved,

By Administration (See Table II)

--- 19.2% were two-year SUNY units (State University of New York)

--- 3.8% were Ag & Tech. SUNY

--- 11.5% were four-year SUNY

--- 19.2% were four-year Sectarian

--- 46.2% were four-year Non-Sectarian

By Sex Enrollment

--- 15.4% were all-male

--- 23.1% were all-female

--- 61.5% were co-ed

By Enrollment Size (See Table III)

--- 53.8% were small schools

--- 34.8% were medium schools

--- 11.5% were large schools

Institutions with Unrest Categorized as Demonstrations

Of the 156 institutions which experienced unrest in the Spring of 1970, 115 or 74%, categorized this unrest as demonstrations. The majority (60%) of administrators at these institutions considered the demonstrations somewhat harmful to the normal functioning of the college, but not critical. A third felt the demonstrations represented healthy dissent. 8.7% considered such activities a critical disruption of college functions--5.2% with positive impacts and 3.5% with negative impacts. (See Table I)

A further analysis of the institutions where demonstrations took place shows that they constituted:

By Type of Administration (See Table II)

--- 17.4% were two-year SUNY units

--- 9.6% were four-year SUNY units

--- 1.7% were SUNY Agricultural and Technical units

--- 4.3% were two-year CUNY units (City University of New York)

--- 7.8% were four-year CUNY units

--- 2.6% were two-year Sectarian units

--- 17.4% were four-year Sectarian units

--- 1.7% were two-year Non-Sectarian units

--- 37.4% were four-year Non-Sectarian units

By Sex Enrollment

--- 2.6% were all-male schools

--- 11.3% were all female schools

--- 86.1% were coeducational schools

By Enrollment Size (See Table III)

--- 34.7% were small schools (0-1,250)

--- 40.9% were medium schools (1,250-5,000)

--- 24.4% were large schools (5,001-35,000)

Institutions with Unrest Categorized as Direct Confrontations

The term "direct confrontations" refers to such actions as forceful occupation of buildings, forceful disruption of classes and other academic proceedings, etc. Administrators from 8 colleges categorized unrest at their institution in such a way. None of these administrators felt the unrest was healthy dissent. Three (42.8%) felt the unrest was somewhat harmful. The majority, four institutions, considered the demonstrations a critical disruption.

By Type of Administration (See Table II)

--- 12.5% were two-year SUNY units

--- 12.5% were SUNY Agricultural and Technical units

--- 12.5% were two-year CUNY units

--- 12.5% were four-year CUNY units

--- 50.0% were four-year Non-Sectarian units

By Sex Enrollment

--- 12.5% were small schools

--- 37.5% were medium schools

--- 50.0% were large schools

By Enrollment Size (See Table III)

--- 12.5% were small schools

--- 37.5% were medium schools

--- 50.0% were large schools

Institutions with Unrest Categorized as Indirect Confrontations

Indirect confrontations are probably the most serious form of unrest. They comprise actions of firebombing, vandalism, large scale destruction of property and indirect threats to life. Seven institutions experienced such occurrences. Of these, one administrator considered the situation somewhat harmful, two considered it critical disruption with positive impacts, three considered it critical disruption with negative impacts, while only one administrator considered the occurrence, healthy dissent.

The institutions involved,

By Administration (See Table II)

--- 14.3% were SUNY Agricultural and Technical units

--- 71.4% were four-year SUNY units

--- 14.3% were four-year Non-Sectarian units

By Sex Enrollment

--- 100% were co-educational schools

By Enrollment Size (See Table III)

--- 14.3% were medium schools

--- 85.7% were large schools

Conclusions about the Type and Severity of Unrest

The type and severity of the unrest that took place on the college and university campuses in the Spring of 1970, differed from that which took place in the preceding two-years. In the

Spring 1970 semester the instances of both intellectual ferment and direct confrontations decreased markedly, while the incidence of demonstrations doubled over the number in the two previous years.

Type of Unrest	1967-68 & 1968-69	Spring 1970
Intellectual ferment	58 38.7%	26 16.6%
Demonstrations	66 44.0%	115 73.7%
Direct Confrontations	26 17.3%	8 5.1%
Indirect Confrontations	---* ---	7 4.5%
Total.....	150 100%	156 100%

* The survey covering the academic years 1967-69 did not contain a category for indirect confrontations. It is possible that the administrators who responded at that time interpreted fire-bombings and destruction of property to be direct confrontations and placed them in that category. However, even if they omitted such instances, the number of confrontations has been halved.

Even though the more serious forms of unrest decreased and intellectual ferment and demonstrations (91% of total unrest), predominated in the Spring of 1971, the administrators indicated the unrest to be much more severe than in the past.

Severity of Unrest	1967-68 & 1968-69	Spring 1970
Healthy Dissent	95 62.9%	52 33.5%
Somewhat Harmful	48 31.8%	84 54.2%
Critical Disruption	8 5.3%	19 12.3%
Total*.....	151 100%	155 100%

Two-thirds of the unrest was considered to be somewhat harmful to or critically disruptive of the normal functioning of the college against only 37.1% of the unrest in the previous two academic years.

The type of unrest that took place on the college campuses in the Spring of 1970 differed from that which had previously occurred. The mildest and most healthy form, intellectual ferment, appeared half as frequently. In conjunction with this, the most forceful and severe form of unrest, direct confrontations, also occurred with half the frequency, while unrest in the form of demonstrations increased dramatically. Although the most serious form of unrest was in little evidence, the new character of unrest created a situation which caused the majority of administrators to feel that unrest on their campuses was detrimental to the institution.

* The discrepancy in the total figures is due to an institution answering one question, but not the other.

A more detailed anlaysis of the type and severity of unrest reveals some relationships with characteristics of the institutions involved.

Type of Unrest (See Tables II and III)

The all-male and all-female colleges engaged in intellectual ferment and demonstrations exclusively. Direct and indirect confrontations occurred solely on the campuses of co-educational schools.

Intellectual ferment was confined to all schools in the SUNY system and to the four-year private schools where it predominated (65.4%). Intellectual ferment was not present in any of the CUNY schools or any of the two-year private schools. Demonstrations took place in all types of schools, regardless of administration. 50% of the direct confrontations happened at the four-year non-sectarian colleges. The rest were distributed among the CUNY system and two-year SUNY schools.

Five of the seven cases of indirect confrontations happened on the campuses of four-year SUNY schools. None of the sectarian institutions had any severe form of unrest.

The relationship of the enrollment size of an institution to the type of unrest experienced is not very clearcut, except that the more severe forms of unrest predominate at the larger institutions. Institutions of all sizes experienced intellectual ferment and demonstrations. Half of the instances of direct confrontation took place at institutions with enrollments larger than 10,000; 37.5% took place at schools with enrollments between 1,251 and 5000.

Severity of Unrest (See Tables IV and V)

Administrators of all-male and all-female institutions considered the majority of unrest at their schools to be healthy dissent (57.1% and 57.9% respectively). None of these schools occasioned either direct or indirect confrontations. Confrontations of both kinds were confined to co-educational colleges and universities.

Healthy dissent occurred at institutions with all types of administrations. Unrest considered to be somewhat harmful to the normal functioning of the college took place at all administrative types of schools reporting unrest but the two-year non-sectarian colleges and predominated in the four-year non-sectarian institutions. Critical disruptions with positive impacts occurred at all administrative types of the public schools except the SUNY community colleges and at the four-year private schools. 70% of the institutions experiencing this degree of severity were four-year schools. Critical disruptions with negative impacts were experienced exclusively at the four-year public and private institutions -- 55.5% in the public sector.

Enrollment size of an institution again seems to be related to severity of unrest. Unrest categorized as healthy dissent or somewhat harmful occurred in schools of all sizes. 70% of the critical disruptions with positive impacts were at schools of 2,001 to 18,000 enrollment. Critical disruptions with negative impacts occurred almost exclusively (88.8%) in schools with enrollments greater than 5,000 (77.7% in schools with enrollments larger than 10,000.).

In summation, when considering the type of unrest on a college campus, intellectual ferment and demonstrations took place at almost all institutions reporting unrest no matter what criteria were employed. The serious types of unrest, direct and indirect confrontations, occurred only in co-educational institutions, and in the medium and larger sized institutions, indirect confrontations being concentrated in the largest schools. Direct confrontations took place in the public schools (except four-year SUNY) and in the four-year non-sectarian private school. Indirect confrontations were concentrated in the four-year SUNY units.

Severity of unrest followed a similar pattern. The least severe forms, healthy dissent and somewhat harmful, occurred across the board. Critical disruptions were experienced only in co-educational schools, in general in medium and large sized institutions and almost totally in four-year institutions both public and private. It, therefore, appears that the more serious the type of unrest and the more severe that unrest is, the likelihood is that it will occur in a large co-educational four-year college or university. This conclusion is in accordance with the findings concerning unrest during the academic years 1967-68 and 1968-69.

Who was involved in the unrest?

Last year's report stated that "the relative numbers of students involved in any given case of campus unrest appears to be quite small, usually under 5%." In looking at the figures for the proportion of students actively involved in unrest in May of 1970 the situation has altered radically. Less than a third of the institutions had such a small number of active participants. At 35% of the colleges

where unrest occurred, 6-20% of the student body was activated. Even more dramatically, 28% or 38 schools, had as much as 31-80% of the campus actively involved in an instance of unrest.

Which type of schools had the most active student bodies? It appears that at the co-educational institutions the largest numbers of students participated in unrest. These students generally attended public and private four-year institutions. Of all the schools, CUNY had the most active student body. At 40% of the CUNY community colleges, 30-60% of the students were participants. At as many as 50% of the four-year CUNY schools, 30-60% of the students were active. The schools with the smallest number of activists were the SUNY community colleges and the two-year private schools.

When large percentages of student body participated actively in an instance of unrest, they tended to attend institutions with an enrollment of between 601 and 2,000. It appears that at the larger institutions it is more difficult to enroll a great percentage of the student body to support any one issue. However, it must be remembered that 10% of a student body of 15,000 is 1,500 individuals. The same number of students is 75% of the student body in a school of 2,000.

Intensity and Duration of Unrest

During the school years 1967 - 68 and 1968- 69, physical violence to persons and to property that accompanied instances of campus unrest were of a minimal nature. The incidence of violence in May 1970 remained low, though three times as great.

Violence associated with campus unrest occurred only 11 times in the earlier period, whereas there were 28 instances of violence in May 1970 - 11 to persons and 17 to property.

Because the trend toward violence showed an increase, it is interesting to note the institutional characteristics associated with violence. In May 1970, violent acts occurred only on co-educational campuses and for the most part at universities where undergraduate and graduate students are mixed. Entirely undergraduate schools had only 3 violent incidents; the graduate schools had none. For some reason, it appears that a combination of graduate and undergraduate students can be a combustible mixture. Why this is can only be conjectured. The graduate school that is not connected by faculty to an undergraduate school is a professional institution with older, more goal-directed students. The first survey, and other studies, have shown that student activists have tended to be social science majors. It can be hypothesized that when the undergraduate shares the same faculty as these students and associates with them in various ways that a certain interaction takes place which results in the more demonstrative forms of behavior. Exactly why this is cannot be determined with the data available.

Violence also seems to have some relationship to school size and type of administration. One half of the violent acts were exhibited in schools with an enrollment of between 5,000 and 10,000 students. This was the only enrollment category that revealed any pattern. When analyzed by type of administration, 21 of the 28 violent acts occurred at institutions of four years or more. The

majority occurred at four-year SUNY schools, while 8 took place on four-year non-sectarian campuses.

The duration of campus activity or unrest also increased in the spring of 1970. In the previous two year period, 120 of 150 campuses experiencing unrest had activity that lasted 5 days or less. In 1970 only 91 institutions had unrest that continued from 11 to 35 days. As the duration of unrest increased, so also did the number of institutions experiencing a stoppage of classes. The earlier survey revealed that only 15 institutions lost any class days. In May 1970, 92 of the 156 institutions reporting unrest experienced a class stoppage. 45% was at the four-year non-sectarian schools, with the rest mainly at the four-year SUNY, four-year CUNY and four-year sectarian colleges. 80% of the administrators stopped classes voluntarily. Involuntary stoppage took place at 7 four-year non-sectarian schools, 4 four-year SUNY schools, 3 four-year CUNY schools and 1 CUNY community college. Only the administrators at co-educational colleges were forced to stop classes involuntarily.

Class days that were lost were reported as resulting in positive or negative impacts. 75 institutions lost class days with resulting positive impacts. The number of days lost was generally 1/2 to 3-1/2 days. Fewer institutions (34) reported class days lost with negative impacts, but the number of days these institutions lost tended to be greater -- 65% of them lost from 3 - 12 days.

Nature of the Unrest: The Issues

When asked if the unrest experienced during the spring of 1970 was qualitatively different from that previously experienced, the college administrators overwhelmingly responded "yes" (85%). These differences reflect changes in the numbers involved, the intensity of the unrest, the target of the unrest, and the substance of the issues.

The number of students, faculty, and administrators, actively involved was significantly greater. The number of incidents of unrest increased and assumed a significantly greater degree of severity. More administrators noted the presence of an outside organizational nexus than in the past. They felt that the number of issues had increased, that the substance of the issues had changed, and that the target of the unrest had changed. Issues engaging the students shifted from issues of campus and local concern to ones of national concern. The college or university no longer took the brunt of student energies. In the words of a SUNY college administrator, the:

> protestors stated the college was not their substantive target. They were using the college as a symbolic and available target to dramatize their concern over the war in Southeast Asia, its expansion into Cambodia, and the deaths of the four Kent State students.

Thus, the target of unrest changed and bred a new type of campus activism. In the words of another college administrator:

> New groups of students and a new pattern of action accompanied the May, 1970 campus scene. The developments could hardly be termed "unrest" in the traditional sense; yet the style of university life underwent significant change. The new target became the Nixon administration and all that that symbolizes.

The feelings of the students and the reasons for the May upheavals is described by the President of a Seminary:

> The students are deeply troubled at the inability of the United States to handle effectively the problem of war either in Asia or the Middle East, the problems of poverty and the problems of racism. These have impinged at a far deeper level into their consciousness in the course of recent years than in the past. There is an emerging cynicism about the country which is deeply upsetting to us all.

The concern of the students has shifted substantially from interest in problems of the campus community to grave distress over the Federal and State government and its effect on our lives and the lives of people in other areas of the world.

The administrators were asked what the major issues were that precipitated unrest on their campuses: 462 responses were elicited of which 348 or 75% mentioned disagreement with the Government over its policies, priorities, actions and inactions. The triggering incidents causing disturbances in May were the expansion of the war into Cambodia and the killings on the campuses of Kent State and Jackson State. On 86% of the campuses where unrest occurred the continuation of the war in Southeast Asia and its expansion into Cambodia were major issues. 81% of the campuses experienced unrest due to the killings at Kent and Jackson States. Another governmental issue mentioned was the priority of military expenditures and research both on and off campus at a time when the students feel there are so many urgent problems of a different nature with which to deal. In this connection, the presence of ROTC on campus provoked many students. Twenty-four institutions

reported that the lack of credibility and responsiveness of Federal, State and local governments was the issue which precipitated unrest. Use of the police force and national guard on campus angered students at 20 schools. Inability to exact political change and the resultant sense of futility was a factor mentioned by 10 administrators. Students are also dismayed over general social problems, especially environmental pollution, which they feel the government has not confronted properly or solved.

While national issues predominated in May, 46% of the administrators also mentioned issues relating to the college itself. The prevailing matters in dispute were college governance and the academic aspects of campus life. At 22 schools students felt they had a marked lack of power in the government of the college and were requesting that this be rectified. In this area the matter of tenure decisions and evaluation of faculty were mentioned in particular. In the academic area, students were discontented with phases of the curriculum, the instruction they received, grading procedures and the university system in general.

Three other issues were mentioned as precipitators of unrest. Thirteen administrators felt that upheavals on their campuses occurred because of widespread media coverage of campus unrest or the empathy of their students with students from other colleges. In 7 instances conflict occurred because a substantial number of students resented the tactics employed by the hard core minority. Finally, 18 institutions reported their students to be concerned over the justice, self-determination and the problems of minority

peoples. A substantial proportion of this response mentioned the trial of the Black Panther leaders. It was also related to the problems of Blacks on campus and social problems in the general society.

Major Impacts of Unrest on the Campus and on the Larger Society

The changes in the target and substance of unrest last spring, combined with the increased number of involved students brought about many reactions from the university community and the society at large. Looking at public institutions in the State of New York, there appear to be similarities between the impacts found by both the community colleges and the 4-year institutions. In both types of schools the impacts were reported as predominantly positive (75% of the community colleges and 65% of the 4-year schools). The most frequently mentioned positive impact was an increased solidarity and cooperativeness by members of the university community. In the community colleges, a feeling of oneness was particularly generated from a strong communal desire to avoid violence. An improved system of communications among members of the academic community was another positive aspect mentioned. Although only one community college brought up the establishment of a college-wide committee to increase student participation in the college decision-making process, the 4-year public institutions stressed student involvement in college governance procedures to a much greater degree. The two year and four year public institutions made equal attempts to reach their local communities about the issues with which they were concerned.

Negative impacts found at 2-year public institutions were similar in nature to those experienced at the four-year public institutions. A number of administrators noted that the disruptions on their campuses brought about an unhealthy climate which was not conducive to the pursuit of academic endeavors. Administrators also mentioned the disruptive polarization of opinion that occurred and a back-lash from the local community resulting from the activities of various members of the college.

In the private institutions of this State, administrators also felt that the unrest resulted in more positive impacts than negative ones, and the positive impacts were similar in nature to those of the public institutions. The unrest in May 1970 brought about enhanced rapport among different factions in the university and in the surrounding community. Students were allowed more meaningful involvement in college governance, or recognition was made of the necessity to effect such involvement. Opened lines of communication among students, faculty and administrators seemed to be a major result of disturbances at all institutions. Administrators from private as well as public schools mentioned the determination on the part of most to work within democratic channels. At some institutions the unrest resulted in educationl reform and increased community service programs.

The major negative impact described was a polarization over issues which created a divisiveness on the campus which some administrators felt to be the antithesis of scholarly enterprise. A negative impact was cited which had no parallel in the public schools: one campus experienced a complete rejection of authority

and the legal system.

One may conclude from an analysis of administrative responses that there is a homogeneity in those impacts categorized as positive and in those which were negative. Also, the type of institution (public, private, four-year or two-year) does not play a determining role in whether the positive impacts will outweigh the negative.

The majority of administrators felt that student unrest on their campuses was by and large a healthy experience with accompanying educational value. Several praised the students for their political astuteness and respect for the legal system. As it has been mentioned, many administrators viewed most of the impacts of the unrest as beneficial to the institution. An example of this is that college administrators realized the deficiencies and incapabilities of their institution for dealing with unrest and hence formulated plans to rectify the situation and be prepared to cope with unrest in the future. Polarization of the university and divisiveness among various campus groups constituted the major negative impacts.

Conclusions

In May of 1970, the colleges and universities of New York experienced a new form of student activism, one essentially different in all respects from the unrest of the preceding academic years 1967-68 and 1968-69. The main distinctions were (1) an intensification of almost all aspects of campus unrest and (2) a dramatic change in the issues concerning students.

Unrest in the form of demonstrations, rather than intellectual ferment or direct confrontations, predominated in May and this unrest was considered much more severe than disturbances in the past. 66% of the administrators (as compared to 37% in the previous years) considered the unrest somewhat harmful to or a critical disruption of the normal functioning of their schools.

The number of students actively involved increased. So also did the duration of the unrest and the number of schools where classes were discontinued during the upheavals. Students at units of the City University of New York were the most active, with up to 60% participating in some instances of unrest. When large percentages of the student body were involved they generally attended the smaller schools. The institutions at which administrators were forced to shut down classes were all 4-year or more co-educational institutions (public and private non-sectarian).

Violent actions to people and property were more prevalent than ever before but did not occur in great quantity. They occurred at co-educational universities with shared faculties in the undergraduate and graduate departments. Violence was largely confined

to the State University of New York and private non-sectarian schools.

Unrest took place in all schools in the City University of New York system and all the four-year institutions of the State University of New York. Of the 36 two-year SUNY schools, only 5 were free from unrest. In the private sector, only 25% of the two-year sectarian schools, 40% of the two-year non-sectarian schools, and 53% of the four-year sectarian institutions experienced any unrest, while 88% of the four-year non-sectarian colleges were troubled with unrest. Schools with the most harmful types of unrest and which experienced the most critical disruptions tended to be

----institutions of 4 or more years

----co-educational

----medium to large in size

----public and private non-sectarian

Unrest in May 1970 shifted from concern with matters of the institution, social and academic, to issues of national concern. There was great criticism of the present Federal administration, especially the decision to expand the war into Cambodia and the movement of the National Guard onto the campuses of Kent State and Jackson State, with the resulting tragic deaths. Racism was no longer reported as a prominant issue.

Although the unrest was more intense, severe and disruptive than in the past, administrators in general (not all) looked upon the disturbances on their campuses in a positive way. They felt the students have come in large part, to channel their energies into legitimate or socially approved avenues of behavior. Despite the polarization that occurred over issues and among people, over

time the members of the academic community have come to a better understanding of one another. Most importantly, avenues of communications have been opened that did not exist before and measures are being taken to rectify present problems and alleviate any unrest that might occur in the future.

TABLE I

TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO SEVERITY OF THE UNREST

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

Type of Unrest

Severity	Intellectual Ferment	Demonstrations	Direct Confrontations	Indirect Confrontations	TOTALS
Healthy Dissent	15 28.8% 57.7%	36 69.3% 33.3%	0	1 1.9% 14.3%	52 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical	11 13.1% 42.3%	69 82.1% 60.0%	3 3.6% 42.8%	1 1.2% 14.3%	84 100%
Critical disruption with positive impacts		6 60.0% 5.2%	2 20.0% 28.6%	2 20.0% 28.6%	10 100%
Critical disruption with negative impacts		4 44.4% 3.5%	2 22.2% 28.6%	3 33.3% 42.8%	9 100%
Other					0
TOTALS	26 100%	115 100%	7 100%	7 100%	155 100%

TABLE II

TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO TYPE OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

Type of College Administration

Type of Unrest	Community College - CUNY	Community College - SUNY	Agr. and Tech. SUNY	4 Year or more CUNY	4 Year or more SUNY	2 year sectarian	2 year non-sectarian	4 year or more sectarian	4 year or more non-sectarian	TOTAL
Intellectual Ferment		5 19.2% 19.3%	1 3.8% 20.0%		3 11.5% 15.8%			5 19.2% 20.0%	12 46.2% 20.0%	26 100%
Demonstrations	5 4.3% 83.3%	20 17.4% 76.9%	2 1.7% 40.0%	9 7.8% 90.0%	11 9.6% 57.9%	3 2.6% 100.0%	2 1.7% 100.0%	20 17.4% 80.0%	43 37.4% 71.7%	115 100%
Direct Confrontations	1 12.5% 16.7%	1 12.5% 3.8%	1 12.5% 20.0%	1 12.5% 10.0%					4 50.0% 6.7%	8 100%
Indirect Confrontations			1 14.3% 20.0%		5 71.4% 26.3%				1 14.3% 1.7%	7 100%
TOTAL	6 100%	26 100%	5 100%	10 100%	19 100%	3 100%	2 100%	25 100%	60 100%	156 100%

TABLE III

TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO SIZE OF INSTITUTION

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

Enrollment Size

Type of Unrest	Under 200	201 - 600	601 - 1,250	1,251 - 2,000	2,001 - 5,000	5,001 - 10,000	10,001 - 18,000	18,001 - 35,000	TOTAL
Intellectual Ferment	3 11.5% 60.0%	4 15.4% 19.0%	7 26.9% 24.1%	5 19.2% 17.8%	4 15.4% 12.5%		2 7.7% 16.1%	1 3.8% 14.3%	26 100%
Demonstrations	2 1.7% 40.0%	16 13.9% 76.2%	22 19.1% 75.9%	21 18.3% 75.0%	26 22.6% 81.2%	18 15.7% 81.8%	7 6.1% 58.4%	3 2.6% 42.8%	115 100%
Direct Confrontations		1 12.5% 4.8%		1 12.5% 3.6%	2 25.0% 6.2%		2 25.0% 16.6%	2 25.0% 28.6%	8 100%
Indirect Confrontations				1 14.3% 3.6%		4 57.1% 18.2%	1 14.3% 8.4%	1 14.3% 14.3%	7 100%
TOTAL	5 100%	21 100%	29 100%	28 100%	32 100%	22 100%	12 100%	7 100%	156 100%

TABLE IV

SEVERITY OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO TYPE OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

Severity of Unrest	Community College - CUNY	Community College - SUNY	Agr. and Tech. SUNY	4 year or more CUNY	4 year or more SUNY	2 year sectarian	2 year non-sectarian	4 year or more sectarian	4 year or more non-sectarian	TOTAL
	Type of College Administration									
Healthy Dissent	2 3.8% 33.3%	11 21.2% 42.3%	2 3.8% 40.0%	2 3.8% 20.0%	3 5.8% 15.8%	2 3.8% 66.7%	2 3.8% 100.0%	13 25.0% 52.0%	15 28.8% 25.4%	52 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical	2 2.4% 33.3%	15 17.8% 57.7%	2 2.4% 40.0%	5 6.0% 50.0%	11 13.1% 57.9%	1 1.2% 33.3%		11 13.1% 44.0%	37 44.0% 62.7%	84 100%
Critical disruption, positive impacts	2 20.0% 33.3%		1 10.0% 20.0%	1 10.0% 10.0%	2 20.0% 10.5%			1 10.0% 4.0%	3 30.0% 5.1%	10 100%
Critical disruption, negative impacts				2 22.2% 20.0%	3 33.3% 15.8%				4 44.4% 6.8%	9 100%
TOTAL	6 100%	26 100%	5 100%	10 100%	19 100%	3 100%	2 100%	25 100%	59 100%	155 100%

TABLE V

SEVERITY OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO SIZE OF INSTITUTION

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

Enrollment Size

Severity of Unrest	Under 200	201 - 600	601 - 1,250	1,251 - 2,000	2,001 - 5,000	5,001 - 10,000	10,001 - 18,000	18,001 - 35,000	TOTAL
Healthy Dissent	4 7.7% 80.0%	12 23.1% 60.0%	12 23.1% 41.4%	12 23.1% 42.8%	5 9.6% 15.6%	3 5.8% 13.6%	3 5.8% 25.0%	1 1.9% 14.3%	52 100%
Somewhat harmful, but not critical	1 1.2% 20.0%	8 9.5% 40.0%	14 16.7% 48.3%	15 17.8% 53.6%	24 28.6% 75.0%	15 17.8% 68.2%	5 6.0% 41.7%	2 2.4% 28.6%	84 100%
Critical disruption, positive impacts			2 20.0% 6.9%	1 10.0% 3.6%	3 30.0% 9.4%	3 30.0% 13.6%	1 10.0% 8.3%		10 100%
Critical disruption, negative impacts			1 11.1% 3.4%			1 11.1% 4.5%	3 33.3% 25.0%	4 44.4% 57.1%	9 100%
TOTAL	5 100%	20 100%	29 100%	28 100%	32 100%	22 100%	12 100%	7 100%	155 100%

APPENDIX L

CHAPTER 19 OF THE LAWS OF 1970

AN ACT

To amend chapter eleven hundred seventeen of the laws of nineteen hundred sixty-nine, entitled "An act to create a temporary state commission to study and investigate the causes of unrest and violence on college campuses and making an appropriation for the expenses to such commission," in relation to extending the powers of such commission and the time when it shall make its report to the governor and the legislature

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. The title and sections one and six of chapter eleven hundred seventeen of the laws of nineteen hundred sixty-nine, entitled "An act to create a temporary state commission to study and investigate the causes of unrest and violence on college campuses and making an appropriation for the expenses of such commission," are hereby amended to read, respectively, as follows:

AN ACT to create a temporary state commission to study and investigate the causes of unrest and violence on college campuses *and in secondary schools* and making an appropriation for the expenses of such commission

Section 1. A temporary state commission to study and investigate the causes of unrest and violence on college campuses *and in secondary schools.* Such study and investigation shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) the manner in which incidents of riot and violence originated;

(2) the concern of students for changes in the structure of our institutions of higher education *and secondary schools;*

(3) the illegal acts intended to destroy, rather than reform, our university system *and secondary school system;*

(4) the proper role of administrators, faculty, alumni, students and government in the university system *and secondary school system;*

(5) the extent to which individuals and influences outside the academic community contributed to such disorders; and

(6) the need for legislation to prevent the recurrence of student unrest and violence.

§ 6. The commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations covering needs, plans and programs to the governor and the legislature on or before February first, nineteen hundred seventy, *and a further report on or before March first, nineteen hundred seventy-one. The commission shall continue in existence until March thirty-first, nineteen hundred seventy-one.*

§ 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

ERRATA

Page 34: Teacher's Strikes[2]

2 See Appendix F